

# *Concordia Theological Monthly*

---

---

Vol. XVI

JUNE, 1945

No. 6

---

## A Re-examination of the Lutheran Doctrine of the Real Presence

---

If one glances through the history of dogma, especially as offered in some of the larger compends, as well as in the more important encyclopedias of theology and religion, one is bound to notice the comprehensive discussions which are contained in these monographs and articles on the subject of the Lord's Supper, or the Eucharist. It is clear that the enemies of the truth, and in particular the archenemy of Christ's Word and institutions, have singled out the doctrine pertaining to this Sacrament for an unusual measure of vicious attacks, until finally large denominations of Christendom have, in their official doctrinal declarations, perverted and denied the Scripture truth in one way or other.

In the early centuries indeed, before Nicaea, the adherence to the simple truth of the Bible is still one of the strong characteristics of doctrinal statements. Ignatius of Antioch calls the bread of the Eucharist the "medicine of immortality" (*Letter to the Ephesians*, chap. XX). The same man writes to the Philadelphians (chap. IV): "Be careful therefore to use one Eucharist (for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup for union [*εἰς ἔνοστν*] with His blood)." It is significant for the further development of the Church's teaching during the next centuries that the concept of an offering (*θυσία*) connected with the Eucharist was occasionally mentioned, though as yet confined to the liturgical prayers and the act of worship. One thing is clear, namely, that until the end of the Apostolic Age proper, the Real or Sacramental Presence was taught, but without the connotation of transubstantiation. The Eucharist was regarded as a communion, or fellowship, through the one bread.

Between the beginning of the second century and the first ecumenic council a number of teachers of the Church expressed

themselves concerning the Eucharist and its doctrine. Here it is even more significant that much stress was laid upon outward form and upon allegory. In the consecration of the liturgy contained in the *Apostolic Constitutions* we find, in the *Epiklesis*: "That Thou mayest send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice as the memorial of the suffering of Thy Son, the Lord Jesus, in order that He may set forth (*ἀποφίνη*) this bread as the body and this cup as the blood of Thine Anointed." The distribution, according to this liturgy, was made in the words: "This is the body of Christ.—This is the blood of Christ." The *Liturgy of Saint James*, the *Liturgy of the Syrian Jacobites*, and others contain similar statements. And with these liturgical statements agree the expositions of some of the great teachers of the period. Thus we read in Irenaeus: "The bread, which is taken from the earth, has the invocation of God upon it, and then it is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist." And in writing against those who despise the entire dispensation of God and disallow the salvation of the flesh, he says: "But if this indeed do not attain salvation, then neither did the Lord redeem us with His blood, nor is the cup of the Eucharist the communion of His blood, nor the bread which we break the communion of His body. For blood can come only from veins and flesh and whatsoever makes up the substance of man, such as the Word of God was actually made." Clement of Alexandria states: "The vine bears wine as the Word bears blood; both are drunk by men into salvation, the wine bodily, the blood spiritually." And Cyril of Jerusalem, just about the time of Nicaea, states: "Consider therefore the bread and wine not as bare elements; for they are, according to the Lord's declaration, the body and blood of Christ; for even though sense suggests this to thee, yet let faith establish thee. Judge not the matter from the taste, but from faith be fully assured without misgiving that the body and blood of Christ have been vouchsafed to thee." So the true sacramental presence was taught and the union with Christ in the Eucharist emphasized.<sup>1)</sup>

A few words might be inserted at this point with regard to the position taken by Tertullian, since at the time of the Reformation Oecolampadius in particular used a statement from that great Church Father in support of his symbolical interpretation of the words of institution. The sentences referred to are found in Book IV, chap. XL, in the treatise *Against Marcion*: "Then, having taken the bread and given it to His disciples, He made it His own body by saying, 'This is My body,' that is, the figure of My body. A figure, however, there could not have been, unless there were

---

1) See "The Eucharist between 30 and 325 A. D." in CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY, Vol. I: 167 ff.

first a veritable body (*corpus veritatis*). An empty thing, or phantom, is incapable of a figure."<sup>2)</sup> However, as Rudelbach points out, the connection clearly shows that Tertullian wanted to emphasize the reality of the body of Christ, as he does also in other parts of this apologetic writing, as in chapter XX. Throughout the argument of Tertullian the reality of the body of Christ, also in the Sacrament, is stressed. In this connection the figure and that which is portrayed belong together as links in the revelation of the mystery of the Eucharist. Tertullian did not speak of the *figura corporis* as a mere symbol, but as a form, or vessel, which conveyed a reality. The Church Father obviously ascribed to the word of the Lord the power to contain His body (*fecit illum suum corpus, dicendo, Hoc est corpus meum*).<sup>3)</sup>

It is more than likely that the term "sacrifice" (*θυσία*) of the early Church Fathers had some influence upon later teachers of the Church, for in the ninth century the concept of transubstantiation, as we now know it in the official teaching of the Roman Church, is plainly found. It was Paschasius Radbertus who first crystallized the idea of an actual, physical change by using the verb *commutari*. He was followed in his ideas by Florus, Hincmar, and others. Although he was immediately opposed by Rhabanus Maurus, by Ratramnus, and others, the notion of a physical change in the elements persisted. When Berengar of Tours, in the eleventh century, openly declared himself against the idea of transubstantiation, a bitter controversy ensued, which culminated in the Council of Vercelli, in 1050, which Berengar refused to attend, and in the Council of Rome, in November, 1078, under Gregory VII, where Berengar was forced to recant in the words: *Profiteor panem altaris post consecrationem esse verum corpus Christi, quod natum est de virginie, quod passum est . . . , et vinum altaris, postquam consecratum est, esse verum sanguinem, qui manavit de latere Christi.*<sup>4)</sup> In spite of all this, however, opponents of transubstantiation continued to assert themselves until the fourth Lateran Council, 1215, settled the matter, so far as the jurisdiction of the Pope was concerned, by stating: *Transubstantiatis pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem potestate divina.* Thus the term coined by Stephen of Autun a century before became the pivotal expression of the official doctrine of the papal Church.<sup>5)</sup> Matters remained in this state till the time of the Reformation.

2) *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, III: 418.

3) Rudelbach, *Luthertum und Union*, 645 ff.

4) Landon, *Manual of the Councils of the Catholic Church*, Vol. 2: 264, 106.

5) See the brief presentation of the controversy in *Theol. Quarterly*, Vol. XIX 18 ff.

When Luther began his reformatory labors, he was soon compelled to fight on two fronts. It took him several years to come to a clear understanding of the error of transubstantiation. In his *Sermon on the Lord's Supper* of December, 1519, Luther is still groping for the truth. But when, in 1520, he wrote his treatise *On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church*, he had made such progress in the knowledge of the truth that he boldly attacked the doctrine of transubstantiation. We quote: "Even so here, when the Evangelists plainly write that Christ took bread and brake it, and the Book of Acts and Paul, in their turn, call it bread, we have to think of real bread, and real wine, just as we do of a real cup; for even they do not maintain that the cup is transubstantiated. But since it is not necessary to assume a transubstantiation wrought by divine power, it is to be regarded as a figment of the human mind, for it rests neither on Scripture nor on reason, as we shall see. . . . Moreover, the Church had the true faith for more than twelve hundred years, during which time the holy Fathers never once mentioned this transubstantiation — forsooth, a monstrous word for a monstrous idea! — until the pseudophilosophy of Aristotle became rampant in the Church, these last three hundred years."<sup>6)</sup> During the next years Luther constantly gained in clearness of the truth, so that Article VI of the Smalcald Articles presents the Scripture doctrine in an unmistakable form: "Of the Sacrament of the Altar we hold that bread and wine in the Supper are the true body and blood of Christ, and are given and received not only by the godly, but also by the wicked Christians. . . . As regards transubstantiation, we care nothing about the sophistical subtlety by which they teach that bread and wine leave or lose their own natural substance, and that there remain only the appearance and color of bread, and not true bread. For it is in perfect agreement with Holy Scriptures that there is, and remains, bread, as Paul himself calls it, 1 Cor. 10:16: 'The bread which we break.' And 1 Cor. 11:28: 'Let him so eat of that bread.'"<sup>7)</sup>

As with reference to transubstantiation, it also took Luther some years to emphasize the *sub utraque* as essential in the doctrine and the use of the Sacrament. With regard to the abomination of the Mass he expressed himself in unmistakable terms as early as 1523, e. g., in his *Formula missae*, and this particular false doctrine became one of the chief points of attack on the part of the Reformer. That was the one front on which Luther fought, namely, against the false teaching of the Roman Church.

But the other front became quite as important in the course of

---

6) *Works of Martin Luther*. Holman Ed., II:190; St. Louis Ed., XIX:25.

7) *Articuli Smalcaldici*, VI, *Conc. Trigl.*, 493.

the third decade of the sixteenth century, namely, that on which the Swiss reformers were active. It is against these that Luther was obliged to launch some of his sharpest attacks, and in this case concerning the real presence of the body and blood of the Lord in the Sacrament. In this treatise *Against the Heavenly Prophets*, the second part of which was published in January, 1525, Luther lays down this principle: "Where the Holy Scripture establishes any point of faith, there one should not deviate from the words as they read, nor from the order as it is given, unless an expressed article of faith compel us to explain the words differently or to follow a different order. Otherwise what would become of the Church?"<sup>8)</sup> Luther then proceeds to apply the principle of hermeneutics to the words of institution, not only in the rest of this treatise, but also in his *Introduction to the First Edition of the Syngamma*, his *Sermon of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ Against the Enthusiasts*, his classic *That the Words of Christ "This Is My Body," etc., Still Stand Secure Against the Enthusiasts*, and his *Large Confession of the Lord's Supper*.<sup>9)</sup>

We quote some of the most significant statements of the Reformer, not only in his explanation of the text, but also in his refutation of the position taken by Carlstadt, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, and others. He grows rather sarcastic in speaking of Carlstadt's suggestion, who placed the emphasis on the τοῦτο, as though Jesus had pointed to His physical body when He pronounced the words of institution. Luther summarizes his discussion in § 84, where he writes: "The word 'this' in all Evangelists will not and may not be interpreted and referred to anything but only to that which Christ offers, namely, the cup, or the beverage, and bids them drink. . . . But if we have concluded this correctly, that in the Sacrament the blood of Christ is truly present, as these words compel us to do, it must be equally certain that in the other part of the Sacrament the body of Christ is truly present." (Col. 233 f.) "What is the communion of the body of Christ? It can be nothing but this, that those who receive the broken bread, every one his piece, receive in it the body of Christ. So that this communion is as much as being partakers together, so that every one receives the common body of Christ with the other, as he says there (1 Cor. 10:17): 'We are all one body because we are all partakers of that one bread.'" (Col. 237.) "There the verse stands and clearly and distinctly states that Christ gives His body to eat as He distributes the bread. On this we stand, believe and also teach that in the

8) St. Louis Ed., Vol. XX, § 39, col. 213 f.

9) St. Louis Ed., Vol. XX: 578 ff.; 734 ff.; 762 ff.; 894 ff.

Lord's Supper the body of Christ is truly and bodily eaten and received. But how this can be or how this comes about that it is in the bread we do not know, nor should we know it. We should believe the Word of God and set neither mode nor boundary for it. We see bread before our eyes; but we hear with our ears that the body is present." (Col. 777.) "Dr. Carlstadt in this holy text 'This is My body' makes a martyr of the word 'this'; Zwingli makes a martyr of the word 'is'; Oecolampadius makes a martyr of the word 'body'; others make a martyr of the entire text and change the position of the word 'this,' placing it at the end, and put it thus: Take, eat; My body, which is given for you, is this. Some make a martyr of half the text by placing the word 'this' in the middle and say; Take, eat; what is given for you, that is My body. Others make a martyr of the text thus: This is My body in remembrance of Me; that is, My body is not here naturally but only as a remembrance of My body, so that the text would read: "Take, eat; this is the remembrance of My body, which is given for you." (Col. 789.) "You should know that it is a matter of pure fiction to say that this word 'is' means as much as 'signify.' No person can ever prove in a single place in the Scripture; yea, I shall say more: if the enthusiasts can bring one proof from all languages of the earth that the word 'is' means as much as 'signify,' I shall grant them the victory." (Col. 905.) Then Luther proceeds to show that the metaphor is never to be found in the copula but in the noun or the adjective. "Since, then, these words: 'This is My body,' according to the sound and usage of all languages, do not mean bread or the figure of a body, but the body of Christ, every one should let this stand and not interpret differently unless Scripture compels us thereto." (Col. 1003.) In his entire exposition Luther adheres unwaveringly to the words of institution, as well as to 1 Cor. 10: 16, 17 and 1 Cor. 11: 29, concerning which he firmly states that they teach the Real Presence in the Holy Supper.

What Luther and the earlier Lutheran Confessions had so clearly and ably set forth, was summarized with equal clarity in the Formula of Concord, Article VII, "Of the Holy Supper." We have here, in 128 paragraphs, a complete presentation of the Scriptural doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, with the antithesis given in sixteen propositions. Among the most significant declarations of the Formula of Concord on the Lord's Supper are the following:

Just as in Christ two distinct, unchanged natures are inseparably united, so in the Holy Supper the two substances, the natural bread and the true natural body of Christ, are present together here upon earth in the administration of the Sacrament. (§ 37, p. 985.)

There is indeed no doubt that He speaks of real, natural bread and of natural wine, also of oral eating and drinking, so that there

can be no metaphor, that is, a change of meaning, in the word "bread," as though the body of Christ were a spiritual bread or a spiritual food of souls. (§ 48, p. 989.)

Therefore also our dear fathers and predecessors, as Luther and other pure teachers of the Augsburg Confession, explain this statement of Paul with such words that it accords most fully with the words of Christ when they write thus: The bread which we break is the distributed body of Christ, or the common [communicated] body of Christ, distributed to those who receive the broken bread. (§ 58, p. 993.) Note here the emphasis: "is the distributed body of Christ."

The other eating of the body of Christ is *oral* or *sacramental*, when the true, essential body and blood of Christ are also orally received and partaken of in the Holy Supper by all who eat and drink the consecrated bread and wine in the Supper. . . . For in view of the circumstances this command evidently cannot be understood otherwise than of oral eating and drinking, however, not in a gross, Capernaitic, but in a supernatural, incomprehensible way. (§§ 63 and 65, p. 995.)

That the elements of bread and wine may be consecrated or blessed for this holy use, in order that the body and blood of Christ may therewith be administered to us to be eaten and drunk, as Paul declares [1 Cor. 10:16]: *The cup of blessing which we bless*, which indeed occurs in no other way than through the repetition and recitation of the words of institution. (§ 82, p. 1001.)

That is the doctrine of the Real Presence as officially held by the Lutheran Church, for the Formula of Concord merely expounds at greater length what had been previously stated in the Large Catechism, in the Augsburg Confession, and particularly in the Smalcald Articles.

Recent developments with regard to the Lord's Supper indicate that various teachers in a number of Protestant bodies found it necessary to discuss the doctrine at some length, also with specific reference to Lutheran teaching. In his excellent monograph *The Conservative Reformation and Its Theology* Charles Porterfield Krauth summarizes his defense of the Real Presence against Reformed attacks in the words: "The Lutheran Church does not hold to any *local* presence of the body of Christ *in*, or any local conjunction of the body of Christ *with*, or any local administration of the body of Christ *under* the bread, or of His blood *in*, *with*, and *under* the Wine."<sup>10)</sup> This proposition is explained in the section just preceding, where we read:

The Lutheran Church denies that there is a *local* presence of Christ's body and blood, and if such a presence be meant, she would deny that there is any presence of them "*in*, *with*, and *under* the consecrated elements." Between us and the Reformed there never

10) Chapter X, p. 460. Thus transubstantiation, consubstantiation, impanation, subpanation are excluded.

has been, there never can be, a controversy on so simple a point as this. The Lutheran Church maintains that there is a *true* presence of Christ's human nature, which is neither local nor determinate. The body of Christ which, in its own nature, is determinately in heaven, and is thus present nowhere else, nor will be thus present on earth till His second coming, has also another presence, diverse from the determinate, yet no less true. It is present through that divine nature into whose personality it has been received, and with which it has formed an inseparable union, whose lowest demand is the co-presence of the two parts. If there be a place where the human nature of Christ is not united with the second person of the Trinity, then there is a place where the second person of the Trinity is not incarnate. If this be granted, then the whole second person of the Trinity is unincarnate, for where God is, He is not in part (for He is indivisible), but He is entire. Then the second person of the Trinity is either not incarnate at all, or He is both incarnate and unincarnate; or there are two second persons of the Trinity, with one of whom the human nature of Christ is one person, the extent of the incarnation being commensurate with that of our Savior's body in heaven, and the other second person of the Trinity omnipresent, but not incarnate, all of which suppositions are absurd, and yet one or other of them must be accepted if the Lutheran doctrine be denied. The truth is that when we admit the personal union of the human nature with a divine nature, we have already admitted the fact in which the mystery of Christ's sacramental presence is absorbed. The whole divine person of Christ is confessedly present at the Supper, but the human nature has been taken into that personality and forms one person with it, hence the one person of Christ, consisting of the two natures, is present, and of necessity the two natures which constitute it are present. . . . If we are asked what is the kind of presence of the divine nature of Christ, we reply, it is a true, illocal presence, after the manner of an infinite Spirit, incomprehensible to us; and if we are asked what is the kind of the presence of the human nature of Christ, we reply, it is a true illocal presence after the manner in which an infinite Spirit renders present a human nature which is one person with it—a manner incomprehensible to us.

Another splendid testimony is that offered by Dr. Francis Pieper in his well-known *Christliche Dogmatik*, where he states, among others:

True, the expression *unio sacramentalis* is not found in Scripture. But the matter designated by the expression is taught as clearly in the Scripture as, for example, the διοούσιος. Christ designates the *bread* which He offers in the Lord's Supper, as His *body* which is given for us. Since, now, the bread is not changed, but remains bread, as the Scripture reports, and since the unchanged bread is also the *body* of Christ, as Scripture likewise reports, therefore the Scripture teaches a *combination*, or *unio*, of the *body* of Christ with the bread, and this *unio* Luther and the Lutherans call the *unio sacramentalis*, because it is peculiar to the Lord's Supper. The expression is fully adequate. It does not have a mere "accessory" relation to the words of the Eucharist, as has been cor-

rectly said with a modern term, but expresses exactly what is said in the words of the Lord's Supper.<sup>11)</sup>

In a collection of essays under the general title *Abendmahlsgemeinschaft?* edited by E. Wolf,<sup>12)</sup> at least two of the contributors present the Scriptural, Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence correctly. Hopf summarizes this position as follows: "The Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper plainly states that there is not only a relation between the eating and drinking of the elements on the one hand and the reception of the body and blood of Christ on the other, as Calvin undoubtedly also teaches, but that, according to the words of the Lord and of the Apostle Paul, there must be a reference to an actual connection and communion (*Bindung und Verbindung*) of the body of Christ with the bread, of the blood of Christ with the wine." And a point made by Gollwitzer in the same collection is also worthy of careful consideration, namely, when he shows that the sacramental union in the Lord's Supper did not develop out of the Lutheran doctrine of the communication of attributes under the heading of Christology, but that it is based on the words of institution of the Sacrament: "The true proof of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper does not lie in the conclusions (*Konsequenz*) of Christology, but in the contingency of the institution."

The most recent comprehensive treatment of the doctrine of the real presence is found in the pamphlet by Reu, *Can We Still Hold to the Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper?*<sup>13)</sup> A few significant sentences of this essay are pertinent at this point:

Whatever *zōiovvia* may mean, it can be used only then when the relation between two objects is expressed. So here bread and body of Christ are the two objects that mutually participate. It is bread, but bread that has part in the body of Christ; it is the body of Christ, but the body of Christ that has part in the bread; by taking the one we at the same time take the other. And the body of Christ, in which the disciples received part by receiving the bread, was the body that that night, when Jesus was betrayed, was about to be given into death for their sake." (P. 55.)

But even in Lutheran circles there were men, in recent decades, who found it necessary to express a dissenting voice with regard to the doctrine of the Real Presence as taught in the official Confessions of the Church. Thus Paul Althaus, in endeavoring to establish "the most profound sense of the old Lutheran doctrine of the real presence," puts his ideas in the following sentences:

Certainly the sacramental identity has a different meaning with us than in the old Lutheranism: there is no thought of the presence

11) Vol. III: 399.

12) *Abendmahlsgemeinschaft?* Beiheft zur *Ev. Theologie*, 101. 132.

13) Wartburg Press, Columbus, Ohio, 1941.

of a heavenly substance in the bread and the wine—"flesh and blood of Jesus," which are given to us, are the power of obedience to Him, the power of His being given into death, or still better, since there are no saving powers which can be severed from Him, the living Lord, "flesh and blood" is Himself as the One Crucified for us, whose giving Himself for, since He is Himself the Risen, the Living One, has an immediate presence and in this presence may be taken hold of in the bread and wine. We are therefore not dealing with the presence of His natural revelation (*Naturseite*) of the personal manifestation of the Lord (in *this* sense), but with the bodily manifestation of His personal, atoning presence as of the One who was crucified for us.<sup>14)</sup>

And a very similar "explanation" has recently appeared in America, in an article entitled "A Review of the Traditional Lutheran Position on the Lord's Supper." It is interesting to find that the writer of this article, while apparently, like Althaus and others, retaining the idea of the Real Presence, disavows the argumentation of the Formula of Concord. It must be remarked, at least in passing, that the reader is apt to be suspicious of a theological writer who states that "John anticipated the cleansing of the Temple, though, according to the other apostles, it took place not long before His Passion," whereas John 2:20 offers an unmistakable proof for the fact that this was a first cleansing of the Temple, forty-six years after Herod had begun to rebuild the sanctuary; a suspicion which is increased by the insistence upon John 6 as a text dealing with the Lord's Supper, whereas competent theologians since the days of Luther have shown this exegesis to be untenable;<sup>15)</sup> and one is shocked to find that a "rediscovery of the Gospel" is credited to such "scholars as Charles Clayton Morrison of the *Christian Century* and Reinhold Niebuhr."<sup>16)</sup>

The author of this article states his own position on the Real Presence in the words:

It is not, therefore, unbiblical and, therefore, not un-Lutheran to hold that the Real Presence in the Holy Communion is not lost when one holds that, as the mouth receives the consecrated elements of bread and wine, Christ Himself is present, to assure the penitent recipient of the forgiveness of sin, to covenant to him the kingdom, and to feed his soul. (P. 348.)

The reception of Himself with the blessings He wrought for us when His body was broken in death for us, when His blood was shed for us, when thus His life was given as a ransom for many: that is the real presence which does not require the mystifying, mind-baffling theological speculation of *Christ's real, essential body and blood being received with the mouth*. The new testament, or covenant, in Christ's blood is founded on His death—

14) *Die lutherische Abendmahlslehre in der Gegenwart*, p. 46.

15) See, for example, Dau, "The Eucharistic Interpretation of John 6," in *Theol. Quarterly*, XVIII:159 ff.

16) *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Vol. XVII:352 ff., 359.

His broken body and shed blood — not on the eating and drinking of that body and blood *with the mouth*. (P. 350.)

That the human body, through the mouth, receives the "true and essential body and blood of Christ" while assimilating through the process of metabolism only the vehicle that conveys them, the bread and wine, is a *theologoumenon*, a metaphysical proposition which should not be central in the explanation of the Holy Supper. The Real Presence is not conditioned by the "in, with, and under" literalism. Christ is there; the fruits of Calvary are there. Through the Sacrament they are conveyed. Speculation regarding the method should not be an article of faith. (P. 356.)

Needless to say, with such argumentation Marburg becomes a farce on the Lutheran side, and the Lutheran Confessions on this doctrine are disavowed.

But what does Scripture say? The words of institution are clear and simple: τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου . . . τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ αἷμα μου. Matt. 26:26, 27; Mark 14:22, 23; Luke 22:19, 20; 1 Cor. 11:24, 25. In St. Paul's account as well as in that of Luke the second phrase is given in a more complete form: "This cup is the new testament in My blood," thus including immediately the purpose and the benefit of the Sacrament. Whatever figurative language one may undertake to find, in metaphor and synecdoche, in the nouns employed in the text, the force of the simple copula "is" cannot be weakened. Nor can this be done by a resort to the alleged Aramaic formula which our Lord may have used at the time of institution, for the inspired accounts which we have before us are in Greek. We are bound to say, with Luther: "*Das Wort steht zu gewaltig da.*"

And lest men be led astray from the truth by a false interpretation, the Holy Spirit caused the Apostle Paul to dwell more fully on the mystery of the Real Presence, as we see in 1 Cor. 10:16, 17 and 1 Cor. 11:27-29. He plainly states that the cup of consecration is the *xōiavía* of the blood of Christ and that the bread of the Eucharist is the *xōiavía* of the body of Christ. The presence of Christ by virtue of this *xōiavía* is so real to the Apostle that he declares: If any eats this bread or drinks this cup unworthily, he is guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord. And he repeats the thought by emphasizing that the unworthy communicant eats and drinks damnation to himself by not discerning or distinguishing τὸ σῶμα.

Evidently the interpretation of the entire text hinges on the word *xōiavía*, and those who do not, or will not, understand the Real Presence have made every attempt to have it signify a mere communication, or a participation in the wider sense, as it is often used in the classics in the meaning of association or partnership, also in the New Testament, in Heb. 13:16 and elsewhere. But this

does not change the fact that in the great majority of cases in the New Testament the word *κοινωνία* clearly and unmistakably means participation in the narrower sense, *communion*, as Luther and the Authorized Version have it. It does indeed, secondarily, imply that those who partake together of the consecrated elements participate in the blessings of the Eucharist. But the word as applied to the relation between the bread and wine of consecration and the body and blood of Christ can mean only, as even Kittel explains it, "an intimate fellowship."

An unbiased reading of a whole series of New Testament texts should compel the student of Scripture to accept Kittel's definition. (Compare also Reu's explanation as given above.) Thus, in 1 Cor. 1:9 we have the *κοινωνία*, or fellowship, of Jesus Christ; in Phil. 1:5, fellowship in the Gospel; in Phil. 2:1, fellowship of the Spirit; in Phil. 3:10, fellowship of His sufferings; in 1 John 1:3, 6, 7, fellowship with the Father and with His Son, Jesus Christ. An examination of the verb *κοινωνέω* and of the adjective *κοινός* will also compel us to accept the connotation heretofore connected with the words, an understanding which is strengthened by a reading of John 17:11 ff. *Κοινωνία*, then, in the passages connected with the Sacrament, cannot mean transmutation or transubstantiation, nor even the less objectionable terms consubstantiation, impanation, subpanation, since these would still imply an identification locally.<sup>17)</sup> *Κοινωνία* is not the same as *ἰσότης*, equiformity, or *ἐνότης*, union of identity, or, as the classical writers explain it, *συμπάθεια πρὸς ἄλλήλους*, but, in the happy designation chosen by Ignatius of Antioch, *ἕνωσις*, an active noun denoting "becoming united with," "a combination into one union," without giving up essential characteristics. There is a perfect explanation of this miraculous *κοινωνία* in the statement of our Lord, in John 10:30: I and My Father are one, *ἐν* *ἐσμεν*, not *εἰс*, which would denote identity, but the neuter pronoun, which clearly refers to an intimacy of fellowship which is without parallel in all the world. Thus the word *κοινωνία*, correctly rendered by the synonym *ἕνωσις*, gives us the idea of the Real Presence in the Holy Supper.

But there are other factors which corroborate the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist. One is christological in nature, and is closely connected with the fact of the *κοινωνία* in the Sacrament. The Reformed view could not reconcile the fact of Christ's body being both in the elements and in heaven. But Luther was bound to hold, according to Scripture, that if Christ is at all present in the consecrated elements during the distribution, He is also essentially and substantially present, although not locally confined, for Christ is always true man and true God. The clear doctrine

---

17) See CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY, Vol. XIII: 378—388.

of the communication of attributes provided the full background for the doctrine of the Real Presence. In his great classic *Dass diese Worte Christi "Das ist mein Leib" noch fest stehen* Luther puts the situation as follows: "Here Christ walks on earth, and the entire Godhead is personally and substantially present in Him on earth. Now tell me: How can it be true that God be at the same time totally substantially present in the person of Christ, in many places altogether and entirely? . . . If this is true and incontrovertible according to faith that the Godhead is in Christ essentially, personally, for Himself, present in so many places, and that He is yet at the same time in heaven with the Father, it follows that He at the same time is everywhere and essentially, personally fills heaven and earth and everything with His own nature and majesty."<sup>18)</sup>

At the same time Luther distinguishes between the omnipresence of Christ and His special presence in the consecrated elements of the Eucharist. In his *Sermon vom Sakrament des Leibes* of 1526 he clearly states the difference between Christ's omnipresence, by virtue of His word, in all places, "although not in the manner as here in the Sacrament, where He attaches His body and blood by the word to the bread and the wine, to be received also bodily."<sup>19)</sup>

This introduces the other factor which compels us to hold the doctrine of the Real Presence, namely, that of soteriology in the specific sense. If the Reformed viewpoint were correct, we could hardly understand the emphasis placed on the "for you," "for many." Symbols, tokens, signs, remembrances, in themselves do not convey the blessings of salvation to men. But in the words of institution the "Take, eat"; "Drink ye all of it" are definitely connected with the assurance "For you." And the relative clauses "Which was given for you"; "Which was shed for you" compel every honest searcher for the truth to accept the Real Presence as a fact. When Helmut Gollwitzer, in an article entitled "Die Abendmahlfrage als Aufgabe kirchlicher Lehre," asked the question: "Who, even if he wanted to, would dare, in view of the present-day exegetical situation, simply to take over the words of our Lutheran fathers?" Hermann Sasse replied with a counterquestion: "If we, with good reasons, are of the opinion that a careful exposition of the statements of the New Testament on the Holy Supper on the part of the fathers of our Church in the sixteenth century is still more correct than the opinions of modern expositors—is that really a subordination of Scripture to the Confession?" And this question he follows up with the declaration: "Up till now no new biblico-exegetical discovery has become known which would compel us to

18) Weimar Ed., Vol. 23:138—140; St. Louis Ed., Vol. 20:808, § 111.

19) Weimar Ed., Vol. 19:492; St. Louis Ed., Vol. 20:743, § 24.

solve the question of the Lord's Supper in a different manner than it is solved in our Confessions.”<sup>20)</sup>

If we ask, at the end of this brief overview: What, then, is the Real Presence? our answer is this: It is neither transubstantiation, nor consubstantiation, nor impanation, nor subpanation, inasmuch as each of these terms implies a physical, unscriptural conception of the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood; but it signifies that there is a fellowship, or communion, of the consecrated earthly elements, which do not change their substance, with the body and blood of the Savior, in a miraculous manner which has been termed the sacramental presence or union, so that in, with, and under the consecrated bread the very body of the Savior, and in, with, and under the consecrated wine His very blood are distributed, and thus received by all communicants, not qualitatively or quantitatively or locally, nevertheless truly, essentially, and substantially. As the Godhead permeated and possessed the body of the Son of Mary without being localized in it, so the true body and blood of Christ permeate and possess the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper, in a real, substantial presence, without being localized in each morsel of bread or sip of wine. And this doctrine, like all other doctrines of Holy Scripture, is a matter of faith, as Samuel Kinner correctly sang:

Though reason cannot understand,  
Yet faith this truth embraces;  
Thy body, Lord, is everywhere  
At once in many places.  
How this can be I leave to Thee,  
Thy word alone sufficeth me,  
I trust its truth unfailing.

*(Lutheran Hymnal, 306:5)*

P. E. KRETTZMANN

### The Argument in Support of the Hades Gospel

The Hades theologians deny that man's death puts an end to the period of grace and offer a lot of proof for their thesis that God provides opportunities for hearing the Gospel in Hades. Let us examine 21 of these arguments.

1. Their *locus classicus* is 1 Pet. 3:18 f.<sup>1)</sup> This text states, they say, that Christ “preached the Gospel unto the spirits in prison.”

---

20) Asmussen, Hans (and others), *Abendmahlgemeinschaft*, p. 140, note 16.

1) Plumptre: “The *locus classicus* of the inquiry is the memorable passage in 1 Pet. 3:18-20. . . . The suffering of Christ for sin availed to bring to God some, at least, of those who had thus disobeyed” (*The Spirits in Prison*, pp. 111, 114).

But the text does not say that. The word here used is *κηρύσσειν*, not *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*. This latter word always means, and cannot mean anything else than, the preaching of the Gospel. If that word were in the text, it would be a good prooftext for the Hades gospel. But we have here *κηρύσσειν*, and this word does not necessarily mean the preaching of the Gospel. The only meaning that it has is that of a solemn proclamation or any public announcement. What the content and purpose of the proclamation is, this word does not indicate. In the New Testament the object of *κηρύσσειν* is, in the great majority of cases, the Gospel. We have, for instance, Matt. 4:23: "Jesus went about preaching (*κηρύσσων*) the Gospel." But only when the object is named do we know what is being preached. "In itself *κηρύσσειν* is *vox media*; its content can be known only when the object of the preaching is indicated" (Stoeckhardt, on 1 Peter, p. 164). The exegetes agree with Stoeckhardt on this point, even those who insist that in 1 Pet. 3:19 it means preaching of the Gospel. Meyer's Commentary (Huther), for instance: "The word itself does not disclose either the contents or the purpose of that preaching" (English edition, p. 296). And President Timothy Dwight (page 748): "This word has in itself an indefinite meaning, to proclaim as a herald, without specifying the sort of proclamation." And so the statement that "Christ preached (*έκήρυξε*) unto the spirits in prison" does not establish the Gospel of the Hereafter.

Ross H. Stover presents the matter thus: "Does an unbeliever have an opportunity after death to accept Christ and receive his salvation? It is that word 'preach' which leads many to believe in the second opportunity for salvation. Without a knowledge of the two Greek words translated 'preach' in the New Testament, one could never come to a correct conclusion. . . . The word *εὐαγγελίζομαι* means preaching the Gospel of Christ so that men might be brought to an acceptance of God's salvation. *This word is not used in the above text.* Rather the Greek word *κηρύσσω* is that which is translated 'preach' in this passage. The word *κηρύσσω* means preach in the sense of pronouncement. . . . My dear friends, I can find no Scripture in which there is given even a ray of hope that an opportunity will be given the dead to be saved" (*What Do We Know About Life After Death?* Pp. 45—80). The *locus classicus*, 1 Pet. 3:18 f., would be a good proof only if men had the right to substitute *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* for *κηρύσσειν*.

But, say these men, just that right we claim; as used in the New Testament, *κηρύσσειν* is not a *vox media*, but always carries the meaning of Gospel preaching. Meyer's Commentary (Kuehl): "*Κηρύσσειν* ist hier, wie ueberall im Neuen Testament, der technische Ausdruck fuer die heilsanbietende Verkuendigung des

Evangeliums von Christo und vom Reich Gottes." Gerlach: "Das Wort (*κηρύσσειν*) bedeutet vielmehr stets die Verkündigung des Evangeliums, die doch nur den Zweck haben konnte, die Tuer ihres Gefaengnisses aufzutun" (on 1 Peter, p. 564). Luckock: "*κηρύσσειν* is never used in the New Testament for anything but good tidings" (*The Intermediate State*, p. 144). G. Kittel, *Theologisches Woerterbuch*: "Der Inhalt des Kerygmas ist nicht angegeben (1 Petr. 3, 19), aber er wird derselbe sein wie sonst im Neuen Testament. . . . Sein *κηρύσσειν* hatte das Evangelium zum Inhalt." — Wrong again. See, for instance, Rom. 3:21: "Thou that preachest a man should not steal." That is a preaching not of the Gospel, but of the Law. Gal. 5:11: "If I yet preach circumcision." Acts 15:21: "Moses hath in every city them that preach him." Note particularly Acts 10:42: "He commanded us to preach unto the people and to testify that it is He which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead." See also Matt. 12:41: "The κήρυγμα of Jonas." See also passages like Matt. 10:27: "That preach ye upon the house-tops." Did the Apostles proclaim only the Gospel? It is simply not true that *κηρύσσειν* is always used in the New Testament in the sense of Gospel preaching. It is simply not true that it cannot be employed in connection with the *praedicatio legalis* or the *concio damnatoria*.<sup>2)</sup>

And now we ask: Is there anything in 1 Pet. 3:19 f. which determines the contents and purpose of the *κηρύσσειν*? Is there anything there to indicate whether it was Gospel preaching or a *praedicatio damnatoria*? Study the description of the men to whom Christ preached. "They were sometime disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah." Here are not beings who, smitten by the sense of their guilt and God's wrath, are asking for forgiveness and salvation. Here are men who had rejected the preaching of Noah, had hardened themselves against the Law and against the Gospel, had flouted the long-suffering of God, and had exhausted His patience. For them the period of grace had come to an end. God had pronounced His final judg-

---

2) De Wette's Commentary argues that these passages (Rom. 2:21; Gal. 5:11; Acts 15:21) do not disprove the canon that *κηρύσσειν* is the technical term for Gospel preaching, for this *κηρύσσειν*, too, has something to do with the Gospel. Hoenecke comments: "Dieses ist eine der Ungeheuerlichkeiten und Unklarheiten, von denen die neueren Theologen strotzen" (*Ev.-Luth. Dogmatik*, IV, p. 236). Th. Traub: "Wo 'predigen' im Neuen Testament ohne Zusatz steht, bedeutet es immer Heils-predigt" (*Von den letzten Dingen*, p. 84. Our italics). On the basis of this canon, Christ, of course, preached the Gospel to the spirits in prison. But it would be hard to prove that the Apostles, when they "preached everywhere" (Mark 16:20), and Paul, when he "preached to others" (1 Cor. 9:27), and the disciples, when they "preached upon the house-tops" (Matt. 10:27), and Jesus, when he "preached in their cities" (Matt. 11:1), preached only Gospel, no Law.

ment against them and cast them away forever. The judgment of the Flood is a type of the final Judgment. And when St. Peter in his Second Epistle, 2:4-10, speaks of these "ungodly" men, together with the angels whom God did not spare but cast down to hell, and the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, which God condemned with an overthrow, as being "reserved unto the Day of Judgment to be punished," he presents these "spirits in prison" as doomed irrevocably. "Our entire passage," says Thomasius, as quoted by Stoeckhardt in this connection, "is fraught with the dread thoughts of judgment." Preaching unto the condemned spirits in prison, Jesus is not going to revoke the irrevocable judgment of God. He comes to them not as the *κήρυξ* of the Gospel, but as the *κήρυξ* of God's eternal wrath. St. Peter thus indicates clearly that the *κήρυγμα* of Christ was a *concio damnatoria*.<sup>3)</sup>

No, no, they say; St. Peter cannot have used *κηρύσσειν* in that sense; there are weighty considerations which make such an interpretation impossible. The *Pulpit Commentary*, for instance, says: "It cannot be that the most merciful Savior would have visited souls irretrievably lost merely to upbraid them and to enhance their misery." Dr. C. I. Schofield uses the same language: "The objection to the second interpretation [making Christ's preaching a *concio damnatoria*] is that it puts Christ in the position of, so to speak, taunting the irredeemably lost—which is inconceivable. He might have wept over them; He could never have exulted over them" (see *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1944, p. 195). The meaning of this objection is that because Jesus is the loving and merciful Savior He could not have proclaimed God's eternal wrath against these hardened sinners and confirmed the judgment of damnation. We ask: Does the text anywhere and in any way justify this appeal to the Savior's love and mercy? Does the text say that here was an occasion calling for the exercise of His grace?—We might let the matter rest here. But we shall add that the Savior not only wept over the sinner, but, when the occasion demanded it, He also declared: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees.... Your house is left unto you desolate," Matt. 23:13-38. The Savior loves all men, and this same Savior will declare: "Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire," Matt. 25:41. Jesus is the Judge of the living and the dead, Acts 10:42. In addi-

3) Zahn's Commentary (Wohlenberg): "It would be very strange if our text would say that this adulterous antediluvian generation, which everywhere else in Scripture (Matt. 24:37-39; Luke 17: 26 f.), together with the men of Sodom and Gomorrah (Luke 17: 28 f.; Matt. 11: 23 f.; Mark 6: 11; Luke 10: 12; 2 Pet. 2: 6; Jude 7), is presented as the *ne plus ultra* of all wickedness and persistent defiance of God, had been granted another opportunity, before the final Judgment, for deciding for or against the Gospel."

Evangeliums von Christo und vom Reich Gottes." Gerlach: "Das Wort (*κηρύσσειν*) bedeutet vielmehr stets die Verkündigung des Evangeliums, die doch nur den Zweck haben konnte, die Tuer ihres Gefaengnisses aufzutun" (on 1 Peter, p. 564). Luckock: "*κηρύσσειν* is never used in the New Testament for anything but good tidings" (*The Intermediate State*, p. 144). G. Kittel, *Theologisches Woerterbuch*: "Der Inhalt des Kerygmas ist nicht angegeben (1 Petr. 3, 19), aber er wird derselbe sein *wie sonst im Neuen Testamente*. . . . Sein *κηρύσσειν* hatte das Evangelium zum Inhalt." — Wrong again. See, for instance, Rom. 3:21: "Thou that preachest a man should not steal." That is a preaching not of the Gospel, but of the Law. Gal. 5:11: "If I yet preach circumcision." Acts 15:21: "Moses hath in every city them that preach him." Note particularly Acts 10:42: "He commanded us to preach unto the people and to testify that it is He which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead." See also Matt. 12:41: "The *κήρυγμα* of Jonas." See also passages like Matt. 10:27: "That preach ye upon the house-tops." Did the Apostles proclaim only the Gospel? It is simply not true that *κηρύσσειν* is always used in the New Testament in the sense of Gospel preaching. It is simply not true that it cannot be employed in connection with the *praedicatio legalis* or the *concio damnatoria*.<sup>2)</sup>

And now we ask: Is there anything in 1 Pet. 3:19 f. which determines the contents and purpose of the *κηρύσσειν*? Is there anything there to indicate whether it was Gospel preaching or a *praedicatio damnatoria*? Study the description of the men to whom Christ preached. "They were sometime disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah." Here are not beings who, smitten by the sense of their guilt and God's wrath, are asking for forgiveness and salvation. Here are men who had rejected the preaching of Noah, had hardened themselves against the Law and against the Gospel, had flouted the long-suffering of God, and had exhausted His patience. For them the period of grace had come to an end. God had pronounced His final judg-

---

2) De Wette's Commentary argues that these passages (Rom. 2:21; Gal. 5:11; Acts 15:21) do not disprove the canon that *κηρύσσειν* is the technical term for Gospel preaching, for this *κηρύσσειν*, too, has something to do with the Gospel. Hoenecke comments: "Dieses ist eine der Ungeheuerlichkeiten und Unklarheiten, von denen die neueren Theologen strotzen" (*Ev.-Luth. Dogmatik*, IV, p. 236). Th. Traub: "Wo 'predigen' im Neuen Testament ohne Zusatz steht, bedeu'tet es immer Heils-predigt" (*Von den letzten Dingen*, p. 84. Our italics). On the basis of this canon, Christ, of course, preached the Gospel to the spirits in prison. But it would be hard to prove that the Apostles, when they "preached everywhere" (Mark 16:20), and Paul, when he "preached to others" (1 Cor. 9:27), and the disciples, when they "preached upon the house-tops" (Matt. 10:27), and Jesus, when he "preached in their cities" (Matt. 11:1), preached only Gospel, no Law.

ment against them and cast them away forever. The judgment of the Flood is a type of the final Judgment. And when St. Peter in his Second Epistle, 2:4-10, speaks of these "ungodly" men, together with the angels whom God did not spare but cast down to hell, and the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, which God condemned with an overthrow, as being "reserved unto the Day of Judgment to be punished," he presents these "spirits in prison" as doomed irrevocably. "Our entire passage," says Thomasius, as quoted by Stoeckhardt in this connection, "is fraught with the dread thoughts of judgment." Preaching unto the condemned spirits in prison, Jesus is not going to revoke the irrevocable judgment of God. He comes to them not as the *κήρυξ* of the Gospel, but as the *κήρυξ* of God's eternal wrath. St. Peter thus indicates clearly that the *κήρυγμα* of Christ was a *concio damnatoria*.<sup>3)</sup>

No, no, they say; St. Peter cannot have used *κηρύσσειν* in that sense; there are weighty considerations which make such an interpretation impossible. The *Pulpit Commentary*, for instance, says: "It cannot be that the most merciful Savior would have visited souls irretrievably lost merely to upbraid them and to enhance their misery." Dr. C. I. Scofield uses the same language: "The objection to the second interpretation [making Christ's preaching a *concio damnatoria*] is that it puts Christ in the position of, so to speak, taunting the irredeemably lost—which is inconceivable. He might have wept over them; He could never have exulted over them" (see *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1944, p. 195). The meaning of this objection is that because Jesus is the loving and merciful Savior He could not have proclaimed God's eternal wrath against these hardened sinners and confirmed the judgment of damnation. We ask: Does the text anywhere and in any way justify this appeal to the Savior's love and mercy? Does the text say that here was an occasion calling for the exercise of His grace?—We might let the matter rest here. But we shall add that the Savior not only wept over the sinner, but, when the occasion demanded it, He also declared: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees.... Your house is left unto you desolate," Matt. 23:13-38. The Savior loves all men, and this same Savior will declare: "Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire," Matt. 25:41. Jesus is the Judge of the living and the dead, Acts 10:42. In addi-

3) Zahn's Commentary (Wohlenberg): "It would be very strange if our text would say that this adulterous antediluvian generation, which everywhere else in Scripture (Matt. 24:37-39; Luke 17:26 f.), together with the men of Sodom and Gomorrah (Luke 17:28 f.; Matt. 11:23 f.; Mark 6:11; Luke 10:12; 2 Pet. 2:6; Jude 7), is presented as the *ne plus ultra* of all wickedness and persistent defiance of God, had been granted another opportunity, before the final Judgment, for deciding for or against the Gospel."

tion, we will say that it is not for us poor sinners to regulate the relation of God's love and God's justice.<sup>4)</sup>

In determining the contents of the *κηρύσσειν* as used by Peter, one might also note this fact: "In our Epistle, St. Peter, in speaking of the Gospel, never employs the term *κηρύσσειν*, but uses other words, as *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*, 1:12; 4:6 *ἀναγγέλλειν*, 1:12; *ἐξαγγέλλειν*, 2:9" (Stoeckhardt, p. 164). And we have already quoted Acts 10:42, where this same Peter calls the preaching of the coming Judgment a *κηρύσσειν*. Lenski: "When Peter wants to speak about *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*, he uses this word, 1:12 and 4:6 (on 1 Peter, p. 170).

Finally, when men make St. Peter teach a second probation for certain classes of men, they make him deny the clear teaching of Scripture that there is no probation after death for any class of men, Heb. 9:27; 2 Cor. 5:10. That would make the inspired writers of Scripture contradict each other.

We conclude this section with a statement by Dr. R. F. Weidner in *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, I, p. 188: "The word that Peter here uses does not in itself define the nature of the preaching nor the effect it may have on the hearer. It may refer to the announcement of pardon to penitents or of the destruction of rebels. It is but a begging of the question to maintain that we have here an example of a probation after death, that Christ here offered an opportunity to the spirits in prison to repent. It does not say so, and it cannot be inferred from this passage" (see M. O. Wee, *Shall I Live Forever?* p. 43).—It might also be worth while to call attention to the findings of Herzog, *Realencyclopaedie*, third edition: "Those who assert that *κηρύσσειν*, as used in the New Testament, in itself means the proclamation of salvation fail to consider Gal. 5:11; Acts 10:42; 15:21; Rev. 5:2. This interpretation, so popular today, is in conflict with the context. . . . The Epistle emphasizes throughout the gravity of the Judgment (cp. 4:17 f.) and will not have it softened down in any way" (*s. v. Hoellenfahrt*). See also P. Koenig's article "Christ's Descent into Hell," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, 1932, p. 833 f.

2. Another *locus classicus* for the Hades gospel is 1 Pet. 4:6. In a way it is the real *locus classicus*. It is quoted as proof that the *κηρύσσειν* of 1 Pet. 3:19 is the preaching of the Gospel. Some are rather hesitant about offering this proof. One edition of Meyer's Commentary says: "Wenn man 1 Pet. 4:6 mit unserer Stelle (3:19) kombinieren darf." And Luckock: "Peter speaks of the Gospel preached even to the dead with an almost certain reference to the 'spirits in prison'" (*op. cit.*, p. 145). But most of them

4) We shall discuss this point more fully when we examine Argument No. 21.—We need not discuss the *ignoratio elenchi* lying in the use of the words "taunt," "exult," etc.

say that you *must* combine the two passages and let 4:6 interpret 3:19. The *Pulpit Commentary*: “*κηρύσσειν* is a word of evangelical sense and . . . is to be interpreted in accordance with the preaching of the Gospel in chapter 4:6.” De Wette’s *Commentary*: “1 Pet. 4:6 proves beyond doubt that the purpose of ‘preaching’ in 3:19 was to save men.” Traub: “St. Peter himself extends the preaching of salvation taught in 3:19 to all the dead, 4:6” (*op. cit.*, p. 87). Lange-Schaff *Commentary*: “1 Peter 4:6 evidently (offenbar) goes back to 3:19. Εὐαγγελίζεσθαι explains the *κηρύσσειν*.”

But 1 Pet. 4:6 is not a good prooftext for the Gospel of the Hereafter. True, here *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* is used, and if you were permitted to combine 4:6 with 3:19 and on the strength of that make “preached” in 3:19 read “preached the Gospel,” you would have won your case. But you are not permitted to do that. For the persons who are the object of the preaching of 4:6 are not the same as in 3:19. Our text does not say: “The Gospel is being preached unto the spirits in prison.” But does it not say: “to them that are dead”? Yes indeed. And does that not mean that the Gospel is now preached to those who are in prison, to the inhabitants of the *Totenreich*? No indeed. Read the whole text. Study the meaning of “judged in the flesh.” There is general agreement that this means the judgment of bodily death (Meyer’s *Commentary*: “It is the judgment of death, as nearly all expositors have rightly acknowledged”). Note also that the text has: “*was preached*.” And you will find this to be the meaning of our text: To certain people who are *now dead*, to the Christians, who accepted the Gospel and became partakers of its wonderful blessings, this Gospel had been preached while they were living, in order that they, although like all other men (“according to men”) they were subject to the curse of bodily death, might live in the spirit, enjoy the spiritual, divine (“according to God”) life, until the day when God would reunite their bodies with their souls. Death has not destroyed their glorious hope! (See Kretzmann, *Popular Commentary*. Also Stoeckhardt, pp. 193—203. Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik*, II, p. 376.)

It is absolutely impossible to make our text say that the Gospel is preached to those whose souls are in “Hades,” the realm of death. For the objects of the preaching of our text are men who must undergo bodily death. And have the souls of the departed their bodies with them? If the Hades gospel men want to use this text, they will have to say that the dead still have bodies, in order that they might be, as the text demands, “judged in the flesh.” Are they ready to maintain this absurdity?—Zahn’s *Commentary* (Wohlenberg): “The clause ‘that they might be judged in the flesh’ proves that the Apostle does not place the preaching of the

Gospel in Hades, the realm of death; for this 'being judged in the flesh' implies a living in the flesh, a life in the body." Lenski: "This σαρκὶ alone answers the question about preaching to dead men in Hades (usually called *Totenreich*). No advocate of missionary work in hell has attempted to show that its purpose could be a judgment of the spirits in hell σαρκὶ. The departed leave the flesh, or body, in the grave. Let us suppose that they did believe the Gospel in hell, then the resultant judgment could not possibly be σαρκὶ." The Hades theologians are in a bad predicament. Stoeckhardt tells them: "There is no other alternative: you must either take the words of the text ('judged in the flesh') in their full sense and then go on with E. Gueder to ascribe to the disembodied dead σάρξ, 'flesh,' or you will have to give up 1 Pet. 4:6 as your prooftext" (*op. cit.*, p. 195). — In the article "Now or Never" (*The Lutheran*, July 26, 1939) Dr. C. H. Little calls attention to the phrase "to judge the quick and the dead" in the preceding verse and says: "If, then, God will judge the dead, not while they are dead, but after they have been made alive, it follows that when it is said in this same connection that the Gospel was preached to them that are dead, it was preached to them, not while they were dead, but before their death, while they were still living upon earth."

Summing up for his side, Timothy Dwight can do no better than this: "The probability as to the meaning of κηρύσσειν 3:19, as connected with usage, must therefore be regarded as overwhelmingly strong against any other signification than preaching the Gospel. This probability is strengthened by the use of the verb εὐγγελίσθη in 4:6, provided that we are to consider that verse as having any close relation to 3:19" (*op. cit.*, p. 498. — Our italics). Dr. Dau sums up thus: "I do not think this view (that the Gospel is being preached to the spirits of departed men) is tenable, because the text does not speak of 'spirits of the departed.' Moreover, the verb in this text is in the aorist, not in the present tense. Lastly, the men to whom the Apostle here refers underwent a judgment in the flesh or as regards the flesh, as the Gospel was preached to them. This could not apply to disembodied spirits" (*THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, 1925, p. 197).

3. What is the meaning of φυλακή? According to the uniform usage of the New Testament it is a place of punishment. See, for instance, Matt. 5:25; Acts 5:18, 19; Rev. 2:10; Rev. 20:7. But Luckock will not have the "prison" of 1 Pet. 3:19 bear this meaning. "What is meant by 'in prison' here? Does it lend any support to the idea that those detained there were undergoing penal confinement for sin and transgression? By no means necessarily. The word is used, it is true, in the New Testament for a place of penal

durance, but etymologically it is simply watch or ward, either for security or custody; and it is a term that might be applied to all who were in the waiting state, whether good or bad. . . . As a place of confinement, therefore, though not of punishment, it may well be called a prison" (*op. cit.*, pp. 145, 147). J. Paterson-Smyth also gives our word this meaning: "Christ descended into Hades—the life of the waiting souls. St. Peter tells us that Christ preached to the spirits in safekeeping who had been disobedient in the old world. For which cause he says, 'was the Gospel preached to them that are dead!'" (*The Gospel of the Hereafter*, p. 35.) So also Plumptre: "Christ preached 'to the spirits in prison,' to human spirits, who were in that Hades which for them was a prison house, in which they were in ward, awaiting a yet future judgment. . . . They were not shut out utterly from hope. . . . They were 'prisoners of hope'" (*op. cit.*, pp. 5 f., 114). *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*: "Die φυλακή ist ein Ort, der sich nicht näher bestimmen lässt, in welchem die Seelen der Verstorbenen aufbewahrt werden, eine custodia, tutatio, oder conservatio (in gutem Sinne)." (See *Lehre und Wehre*, 1899, p. 239.) What is the purpose of giving "prison" this strange meaning? It is to remove the idea—the teaching of Scripture—that there is no hope for the unrepentant sinner after death. It is to establish the idea that some of the spirits in prison are, as Plumptre states, "prisoners of hope."

To be sure, the prison, as described in the New Testament, is a place for "safekeeping," but only in the sense in which it is used 2 Pet. 2:9: "to reserve (τηρεῖν, keep) the unjust unto the Day of Judgment to be punished," and 2:4: "God delivered the angels that sinned into chains of darkness, to be reserved (τηρουμένους, kept) unto Judgment." The souls of the unrepentant sinners are kept in the prison in which the fallen angels are kept under watch and guard; and the final Judgment will not bring a pardon, but will be pronounced in the words of Matt. 25:41. (See Stoeckhardt, *op. cit.*, p. 153.)

The Lange-Schaff Commentary believes in the Hades gospel, but rejects the new interpretation of "prison." "The word φυλακή cannot be rendered otherwise than prison. Das Wort bedeutet immer eine Haft, einen Gewahrsam, einen Kerker. Matt. 5:25; Acts 5:18, 19; Rev. 2:10; Rev. 20:7" (many other passages listed). Lenski: "The Scriptures know of only one φυλακή, 'prison,' that confines 'spirits,' namely, hell, 'hades,' 'the gehenna of the fire' (Matt. 5:22; 18:9). To call this the *Totenreich*, the realm of the dead, is to give a strange meaning to the word φυλακή. . . . Note 2 Pet. 2:9, 10, in fact all of vv. 4-10" (*op. cit.*, p. 165 f.). — The prison confining the unbelieving spirits is not a reform school, but a penitentiary for life.

4. We cannot understand why men would quote 1 Pet. 3:18,19 as proving that those who did not hear the Gospel in this life would have it preached to them in Hades. The text does not speak of men who did not hear the Gospel, but of such as heard it, rejected it, and therefore were damned. E. Hove asks: "Why should this hardened set of mockers and scoffers be mentioned if the intention were to teach us that Christ offered an opportunity of salvation to those who had no such opportunity during their lifetime?" (*Christian Doctrine*, p. 200.) *Lehre und Wehre*, 1871, p. 353: "Note that the text does not say that those who heard Christ's proclamation were men who had not heard the preaching of the Father during their earthly life—and according to the modern teaching God owed it to these men to make up the deficiency through the preaching in the intermediate state—but the text states that the men with whom Christ was dealing were just *those* and only *those* who for a long lifetime had in stubborn wickedness rejected the saving word."

5. Some make the astounding assertion that these "spirits in prison" had not been brought into contact with the saving word during their life on earth. De Wette's Commentary: "The antediluvians had had no Redeemer and no guide to the life of the Spirit. God therefore owed it (if we may use this expression) to them to supply the deficiency, and so at last the risen Savior brought salvation to them in Hades." This characterization of the men of Noah's time is certainly not in harmony with Scripture. It is not only the very opposite of the characterization given in 1 Pet. 3:20 (see under 4), but Scripture definitely states that God had sent to them "Noah, a preacher of righteousness," 2 Pet. 2:5. See also Gen. 6:3. "Man muss ueber solche Erklaerung staunen, da . . . der geduldige Gott ja ausdruecklich sagt, dass die Leute zu jener Zeit sich von seinem Geist, der ihnen ja Wegweiser sein sollte, nicht strafen liessen" (Hoenecke, *op. cit.*, p. 235).

6. Others admit that the antediluvians had had the Gospel preached in their midst, but that they had not rejected it definitely and so were entitled to a second opportunity. We heard Plumptre's assertion: "They had not hardened themselves in the one irretrievable antagonism to good which has never forgiveness. . . . They had not hardened themselves against His righteousness and love and therefore were not shut out utterly from hope" (*op. cit.*, pp. 5, 18). And Plumptre finds such a thought expressed in 1 Pet. 3:20! "Disobedient," disobedient in the face of "the long-suffering of God"—and still men keep on saying with Gerlach: "Many were not irretrievably hardened," and with J. Paterson-Smyth: "These men that St. Peter thinks of had perished in God's great judgment, but it would seem in their terrible fate they had not hardened

themselves irrevocably against God" (*The Gospel of the Hereafter*, p. 66). If St. Peter had meant to express such a thought, he certainly used misleading language.

7. No, says *The Pulpit Commentary*, he did not use misleading language. He gives us a hint that these men had not utterly rejected the Gospel. "Is it not possible that in those words, 'which sometime [italics in original] were disobedient,' there may be a hint that that disobedience of theirs was not the 'eternal sin' which . . . is the awful lot of those who have never forgiveness?" (*Op. cit.*, p. 135.)<sup>5)</sup>

8. Traub, on the other hand, does not attempt to tone down the enormous wickedness of the antediluvians in the least. He lets the words of 1 Pet. 3:20 stand in their full force. "They did not believe, although God was long-suffering. Their unbelief was therefore iniquitous in the highest degree. (See Rom. 2:4: 'Despisest thou the riches of His goodness and forbearance and long-suffering?') Jesus, too, stresses the wickedness of those unrepentant sinners (Matt. 24:38 f.; Luke 17:27)" (*op. cit.*, p. 85). But now he argues: "Since salvation was preached to the antediluvians, who in the days of Christ were considered the worst sinners, then it will certainly be offered also to all the others who are with them in the land of the dead" (p. 87). The Lange-Schaff Commentary uses the same argument. "We shall show that the antediluvian sinners" (italics in original), "not penitents, appear to be singled out because of the enormity of their wickedness, and that the fact

5) Some say that Christ's preaching in Hades was directed to men who had repented while on earth. Bishop Horsley finds it very difficult to believe that "of the millions who died in the Flood all died impenitent" and holds "that the beneficial proclamation of the Gospel was limited to those who repented before death." (See Plumptre, *op. cit.*, p. 98.) Luckock: "There is certainly nothing to forbid us from supposing that the antediluvians here spoken of, though they had been long disobedient and had resisted the striving of God's Spirit under the preaching of Noah while the Ark was in preparation, yet when the Flood actually came in were brought to repentance and sought for mercy" (*op. cit.*, p. 143 f.). And W. Ziethe adds: "Besides those antediluvians (to whom Christ preached the Gospel) there were other countless hosts of spirits in prison, for whom that preaching of repentance and salvation was also meant. We are thinking of the men of Nineveh, who repented at the preaching of Jonah" (*Das Lamm Gottes*, p. 729). We ask, first, what would Christ have to say to these repentant believers? They ask us to wait till they have told us all about the *limbus patrum*. We ask, second, how do you know that some repented during the Flood? There is no Scriptural evidence for it. It is pure speculation. Lange-Schaff: "We must conclude that the expedient which makes those antediluvians to have repented at the breaking in of the Flood, however ingenious, amounts to simple assumption, *eine aus der Luft gegriffene Annahme*." — We shall at some future time treat of this Protestant *limbus patrum*, but have brought up this particular point now in order to give a sample of the bald assumptions and wild guesses with which the Hades theology deals.

of their being made the objects of Christ's tender solicitude seems to shed the light of heaven on one of the most bewildering subjects in religion." There is nothing wrong with the argument that, if God is willing to save the greatest sinners, He is willing to save all sinners, including those with less guilt. But, as applied here, the argument loses all force because the premise is false. "Since salvation was preached to the antediluvians in Hades" etc. It was not so preached.

9. Moffatt likes this version of our passage: "It was in the Spirit that Enoch also went out and preached to the imprisoned spirits . . ." ("Note: 'Ενώχ has been omitted by a scribe's blunder.") *The Expositor's Greek Testament* also likes this version and gives us this exposition: "The spirits who disobeyed in the days of Noah are the sons of God described in Gen. 6:1-4. St. Peter depends on the current tradition in which the original myth had been modified and amplified. . . . The tradition as given in the Book of Enoch is as follows: Angels lusted after the daughters of men. . . . The children of this unlawful union taught men all evil arts. . . . Enoch was sent to pronounce the sentence of condemnation upon these watchers, who in terror besought him to present a petition to God on their behalf. God refused to grant them peace. . . . Accordingly, they are bound." Our expositor goes on to say: "Peter supplements the tradition which he accepts." How? "'Ἐκήρυξεν = εὐηγγελίσσατο. Cf. Luke 4:18. Before Christ came, they had not heard the *Gospel of God's Reign*. Enoch's mediation failed, but at Christ's preaching they repented like the men of Nineveh; for it is said that *angels subjected themselves to Him*, v. 22." Now, what is the purpose of this weird exposition? That is indicated by the statements: "καὶ (v. 19), even to the typical rebels who had sinned past forgiveness according to pre-Christian notions." "But Christians believed that Christ came to seek and save the lost and the captives; all things are to be subjected to Him. So Peter supplements the tradition which he accepts. For him it was important as the greatest proof of the complete victory of Christ over the most obstinate and worst of sinners." If these most wicked sinners had the Gospel preached in the hereafter, there is a future probation for all. Wohlenberg mentions others who interpret our passage in the same way. Knopf, for instance, who accepts the Enoch version, says: "So kommt in der Geisterpredigt Christi der Gedanke der universalen Bestimmung des Christentums zum Ausdruck, und weiter, sofern die Predigt an besonders grosse Frevler ergeht, denen von der juedischen Apokalyptik das furchtbare endgueltige Strafgericht ohne Hoffnung auf Rettung in Ansicht gestellt war, spricht sich darin die Erwartung

der Apokatastasis aus" (*op. cit.*, p. 111). — On the force of the argument see under 8.

10. There are some other points relative to the "Hades preaching" of Christ that need to be clarified. For instance, which class of the unrepentant sinners was the beneficiary of Christ's preaching? We have seen that the Hades theologians are not agreed on this point. Some say that all will hear it with the exception of those who have utterly hardened themselves; others say, all without any exception. We are not interested in the discussion, since we know that no unrepentant sinner will have the Gospel preached to him in "Hades." But we enter the discussion in so far as we warn them not to discuss the question in the spirit of Farrar's contention that Peter "unintentionally limited the fullness of the revelation" by speaking as if the only spirits in prison who received the preaching of the risen Lord were the antediluvians (see *Early Days of Christianity*, I, pp. 126, 140). "Unintentionally"? No Christian theologian has the right to say that the Apostle did not quite say what he wanted to say. He has no right to amend any saying of Scripture.<sup>6)</sup>

11. Next, is the Gospel being preached to the spirits in prison today? Here there is pretty general agreement among the Hades theologians. They say with Ziethe: "We believe that that great work of salvation, which the Son of God began in and with His descent to hell, is carried on continuously till the end of days. We believe that at the present time, too, the Gospel is preached to the spirits in prison in order that they may decide for or against Christ, for their salvation or for their damnation" (*op. cit.*, p. 734). The Apostles are carrying on this work of Christ. *The Expositor's Greek Testament*: "Not Christ only, but also the Apostles preached to the dead." "The Gospel of the Hereafter" appeals to Clement of Alexandria, "who asserts as the direct teaching of Scripture that our Lord preached the Gospel to the dead, but he thinks that the souls of the Apostles must have taken up the same task when they died" (p. 59). Luckock approves of Clement's statement that "the Apostles, following the example of their Lord, preached the Gospel to those in Hades" (*op. cit.*, p. 101). So also *The Pulpit Commentary*, p. 136. The Irvingites, too, teach "that the departed Apostles continue the work of preaching which Christ began at His

6) R. F. Horton, who quotes Farrar's statement in *Revelation and the Bible*, p. 356, comments: "It is a far cry to conclude from this doubtful allusion (that those who were disobedient in the days of Noah received in Hades a visit from the risen Christ) that all who die unrepentant will be evangelized in another world." We might agree with this statement, but we certainly do not agree with the next statement: "The fact is that Peter, like the other Apostles, was left in complete darkness about the ultimate destiny of the lost." What about 2 Pet. 2:4-9?

descent into hell" (*Popular Symbolics*, p. 326). Likewise the Mormons teach missionary work is carried on in the spirit world by Christ and the departed Apostles, J. A. Talmage, *The Articles of Faith*, pp. 149, 150.

All this is pure romancing. Scripture does not say a word about it.<sup>7)</sup> Nitzsch offers this proof: "To confine this work to the three days of the descent into hell is monstrous" (*Christliche Lehre*, p. 377, quoted in Plumptre, *op. cit.*, p. 242). Dorner offers this proof: "The ceasing of the preaching is *neither recorded*, nor reasonably to be supposed—indeed the ancient Church supposed it carried on through the Apostles" (see Strong, *Systematic Theology*, p. 385). No, the *ceasing* of this preaching is not recorded (and that proves nothing). But neither is it recorded that this preaching took place *at any time*. And the Scripture proof offered by Lange-Schaff ("We may therefore suppose with Koenig that the preaching of Christ begun in the realms of the departed spirits is continued there. Cf. 1 Tim. 2:4; 2 Pet. 3:9") is invalid. Look up the passages! So, when Ziethe protests: "Es ist keine Dichtung, meine Lieben, die ich mir etwa ersonnen und euch bisher vorgetragen habe," we shall insist that it is pure romance. We are certainly not going to tell our people that the souls of the Apostles are not in heaven but down in "Hades," waiting to be received into heaven later on.

12. Do you know what Paul meant when he said 2 Tim. 1:12 that God "is able to guard that which he hath committed unto me" (R. V. Margin), that deposit of mine, "meine Beilage"? Simply this: God has instituted a ministry in Hades, committed this ministry to Paul and the others, and Paul is anxious to take over this charge in Hades. (H. Ebeling, *Der Menschheit Zukunft*, p. 31, properly characterizes this vagary.)

13. The Hades gospel provides, further, that the departed Christians share in this work of the Apostles in Hades. *The Pulpit Commentary*, p. 145: "The departed saints spread the glad news of the Gospel among the kingdoms of the dead." Hofman speaks of "the possibility of the conversion of non-Christians in the *Totenreich* through the testimony of risen believers" (see W. Oelsner, *Die Entwicklung der Eschatologie von Schleiermacher bis zur Gegenwart*, p. 57). Luckock: "We shall exercise hereafter in the world of spirits under spiritual conditions those special ministries and peculiar graces which marked our earthly life and work. . . .

---

7) Traub is one of the few who rejects this part of the Hades theology. "Von einer *fortgehenden* Predigt Jesu in der Totenwelt ist nirgends im N. Testament die Rede, ebensowenig von einer *fortgehenden* Predigt der Apostel oder anderer in der Totenwelt. . . . Diese Lehre ist ohne Schriftgrund" (*op. cit.*, p. 93).

The spirits of righteous men are there, and we can well imagine their labors for others in bringing them to the knowledge of God" (*op. cit.*, pp. 101, 186). And Gore's *New Commentary*: "The teaching of 1 Pet. 3:18 and 4:6 suggests that for saints departed, as for the Lord after Good Friday, an evangelistic activity may be possible. There are more souls in the world unseen than here."

*The Gospel of the Hereafter* adds this thought: "Think how it helps in the perplexities about God's dealing when young and useful lives are taken from the earth. I told a man who asked, 'Why should God take away a noble life like that and leave all these stupid useless people in the world?' that perhaps God did not want *only* the stupid useless people. . . . God's elect in the hereafter life are still 'elect for the service of others.'" (Pp. 153, 155.) Ebeling: "Some tell the fable that Christ has instituted a ministry in Hades and often calls gifted men through a 'premature' death out of this world to serve in the Hades ministry" (*op. cit.*, p. 31).

It is pure fiction. Lenski: "Some elaborate this thought (that Christ preached the Gospel in hell). If Christ did this, *somehow* it must still be done: missionary work will be carried on in hell. . . . The Scriptures teach no probation after death, no missionary work in hell, and none in a *Totenreich*, *for none exists*" (p. 169 f.). But Ziethe insists: "What I have been preaching to you is not fiction, not a figment of my mind."

14. What is the result of the preaching of Christ and of the Apostles and of the departed Christians in Hades? "It availed," says Plumptre, "to bring to God some, at least, of those who had thus disobeyed" (*op. cit.*, p. 114). Most Hades theologians are not so positive about this matter as Plumptre, but they, too, insist on having it preached as a blessed truth. Lange-Schaff: "Christ preached to those spirits who in the days of Noah persisted in unbelief and disobedience. Why, what, and with what effect He preached, is not revealed. . . . We are not informed whether few or many (or any.—Mombert) did thereby attain unto spiritual life." *The Pulpit Commentary*: "There is one more question which forces itself upon us—what was the result of this preaching? Were the spirits in prison delivered? Here Scripture is almost silent; yet we read the words of hope in 4:6. May we not dare to hope that some at least listened to that gracious preaching?" (P. 135.) Again, by a different writer: "I cling to the hope that the preaching of the Savior on the other side of the grave will bring multitudes to heaven" (p. 158). Again: "We know not the result of the Savior's preaching; it is hidden from us; conjecture is vain, perhaps irreverent. But we have the fact—the Gospel was preached to them, and the object was that they might live according to God in the spirit" (p. 178). Ziethe: "We do not know what

effect and blessing the preaching of Christ in the prison had. Scripture has revealed nothing to us on that point. But we have the feeling that the imprisoned spirits must have heard and accepted the glad tidings of salvation with joy and rejoicing. We feel and hope that the promise of the Prophet was fulfilled in the *Totenreich*: 'By His knowledge shall My Righteous Servant justify many.' Is. 53:11" (*op. cit.*, p. 733).

No, Scripture does not say a single word on this important point. A. B. Svensson: "Of a mission to the dead or conversion after death Scripture says nothing! There is not a single text that teaches such a doctrine. . . . There is not one word in the text, 1 Pet. 3:19, that gives us the right to infer that the preaching . . . led to the conversion of anyone" (see *Theological Monthly*, 1925, p. 198 f.). And the text quoted by Ziethe applies as little as the text quoted by *The Expositor's Greek Testament* proves that the fallen angels were converted. Those who want to believe these things have no other basis for their faith than human speculations, and in the Church of God the dreams of men should not be presented as divine truth.

The fact that 1 Pet. 3:19 does not say a word about the conversion of the spirits is important for another reason. Stoeckhardt: "If the Apostle had wanted to show that the innocent suffering of Christ" (as preached by Him in the prison) "had power to save those who had been judged on account of their unbelief, he would have had to mention not only the preaching itself, but above all the effect of this preaching, the actual repentance, conversion, salvation of the spirits in prison, or, at least, of a great number of them" (*op. cit.*, p. 165).<sup>8)</sup>

15. Besides 1 Pet. 3:19 and 4:6 the Hades theology utilizes a number of other Scripture passages as prooftexts. Here are a few examples. S. Baring-Gould quotes 1 John 3:8 and declares: "Surely, if eight ninths of the men and the women born into this world were to perish everlasting, then Satan will have triumphed; Christ will have failed to destroy his works" (*op. cit.*, p. 38).— Scriptures teaches both truths: Christ has destroyed the works of the devil, and the greater number of mankind rejects the salvation Christ procured for them. Besides, if Baring-Gould's reasoning were correct, he would have established universalism (apokatastasis), and he disavows universalism.

8) Here is a peculiar kind of romancing. According to S. Baring-Gould the "intermediate class" (see above) "will get another opportunity after this life, and those who make the right use of their opportunity will be saved together with the first class, but will not be glorified." "Salvation will be widely extended to men, who, however, will be far from glorification among the saints" (*The Restitution of All Things*, pp. 46, 143, 146, 152).

Gen. 3:15: "It shall bruise thy head," gets the same treatment. Dr. Chauncey: "How could this be so, if Satan triumphed by gaining millions to be his slaves? In this case could it be said, as in Is. 53:13: "He shall see the travail of His soul and be satisfied, for He shall bear their iniquities?" (See F. W. Farrar, *Eternal Hope*, p. 220.)

Matt. 5:26 is another prooftext. F. W. Farrar: "If the fate of those sinners (1 Pet. 3:19; 4:6) was not irrevocably fixed by death, then it must be clear and obvious to the meanest understanding that neither of necessity is ours. . . . That the prisoners there may be 'prisoners of hope' appears from Matt. 5:26, where the same word, φυλακή, is used" (*op. cit.*, p. 87). — The text does not carry any cheering and hopeful implications. The stern justice of the Judge is emphasized. Again, while it may be possible for a common debtor to pay his debt to the last penny, "this possibility pertains only to the figurative language of Jesus. It pictures no actual possibility for a sinner after death and judgment, because the Scriptures know of no such possibility. "Εως ἀν may raise the question: 'But how will he pay at all in the φυλακή to which God will remand him, to say nothing about the last *quadrans*?' The only answer of the Scriptures is: 'Payment there is impossible'" (Lenski). But Farrar has an answer: "Even if the payment of the debt be not possible to man, it is possible to God (Matt. 19:26)."

Matt. 12:31, 32, Dorner: "When Christ says of a sin that it is forgiven neither in this nor in the next life (Matt. 12:32), whereas other sins are forgiven in this world without limitation, this contains a testimony that other sins, save the sin against the Holy Ghost, may be forgiven in the next world." Julius Mueller and E. R. Stier (quoted in Plumptre, *op. cit.*, pp. 253—260) operate with the same text in the same way. So also Plumptre, page 21. — The text says that all other sins are pardonable, but it does not say that the Holy Ghost will create faith, by which the pardon is accepted, both in this world and in the world to come. The phrase "neither in time nor in eternity" is used only in connection with the sin against the Holy Ghost, to emphasize that this sin will never be forgiven, absolutely never. Again, the phrase "in the world to come," "in eternity," takes in not only the alleged "intermediate state" but all eternity. Then the Hades theologians, if they stick to the text, will have to teach that pardon may be obtained also in hell, and Plumptre and the rest refuse to do that (see *Lehre und Wehre*, 1871, p. 357). It is interesting to note that *The Expositor's Greek Testament* refuses to operate with this text. "Dogmatic inferences, based on the double negation, to possible pardon after death are precarious."

Matt. 11:20-24, says Traub, "shows that among the heathen

population of Tyre and Sidon, and of Sodom, there were some who, if the salvation of Christ had been preached to them, would have accepted this salvation by faith. These words of Jesus can be applied generally. They prove that among those whom the Gospel did not reach in this life there are some who would have accepted salvation if it had been preached to them. It follows that the preaching which did not reach them in this life will, in some way, be supplied later on, in the life beyond" (*op. cit.*, p. 91). Plumptre (pp. 21, 60) and others also use this prooftext.—It is a poor proof-text. If Traub's argumentation is correct, then certainly the people of Tyre and Sidon and Sodom were entitled to the preaching of salvation in the future life. But the text does not even hint at such an eventuality. J. Paterson-Smyth, indeed, says: "Do you not think that Jesus has taken care since that the men of Tyre and Sidon should have their chance? Does Jesus not suggest that He would take thought for these men in the Unseen Land?" (*Op. cit.*, pp. 138, 151.) There is no such suggestion in the text. On the contrary, it mentions their "judgment." "Sodom is a type of extreme wickedness and at the same time a preliminary example of the final Judgment. . . . To say that the fate of the damned is yet to be definitely determined is to overlook that Jesus here has already determined it. In 'more tolerable' lies no probation after death; *the implication is the very reverse*" (Lenski, on the parallel passage, Luke 10:12-15). On the "more tolerable" Kretzmann's *Popular Commentary* says: "All those that have had an opportunity to learn about Christ and His work, but refuse repentance and faith, will receive a severer judgment on the Last Day and will be condemned to greater damnation than other sinners that were not so signally blessed with the revelation of truth."<sup>9)</sup>

John 12:2. *The Gospel of the Hereafter* interprets: "Even such men as those who perished in the Flood, but had not hardened themselves against God's righteousness and love were not shut out from hope. In the '*many mansions*' was a place even for such as they" (pp. 37, 62). Plumptre has the same idea (p. 5, 21).—Rom. 2:14. Plumptre finds that this passage sustains "the wider

9) The phrase "they would have repented" presents, indeed, a real difficulty. If repentance means "outward desistance from gross sins and crimes" (thus Lenski), there is no difficulty. But if it means real conversion, accepting the Gospel by faith, our inquisitive flesh wonders why God did not send the Gospel to them. How shall we answer? We refuse our flesh the right to ask the question. This lies in the domain of the Cur alii prae aliis? Rom. 11:22 ff. forbids us to deal with the question why "God gives His Word at one place but not at another" (Formula of Concord, *Triglotta*, p. 1081). And Rom. 11:22 ff. would, we think, apply particularly when men ask the question and try to answer it: Since God knew that those people would have repented, why did He not bring the Gospel to them?

hope as to the condition of the heathen. We read that 'the Gentiles, which have not the Law and do by nature the things contained in the Law, are a law unto themselves,' and are therefore capable of 'glory and honor and immortality' " (Rom. 2:14) (p. 163 f.).—John 7:17. Plumptre: "The law that 'whosoever willeth to do the will of the Father shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God' (John 7:17) gives a basis for the hope which the wisest of our teachers have in these latter days led us to cherish as to those whom involuntary ignorance or invincible prejudice has kept during life from the full apprehension of revealed truth, or indeed from any knowledge of that truth at all. . . . 'In the Father's house there are many mansions' " (*op. cit.*, pp. 403, 406).

16. Some even use Luke 16:25-28 as a prooftext. L. Schneller: "Were not Moses and the Prophets set before the rich man after his death? Was not the peace and bliss of Lazarus shown to him from afar in order to awaken in him the desire for peace and bliss?" (See CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, 1936, pp. 440, 442.) Farrar: "Dives uplifts his eyes, not 'in hell,' but in the intermediate Hades, where he rests till the resurrection to a judgment, in which signs are not wanting that his soul may meanwhile have been ennobled and purified" (*op. cit.*, p. 196). Plumptre: "The text represents the sufferer as having at last learned to care, more than he had done in his lifetime, for the welfare of others, and the father of the faithful still recognizing the sufferer in Hades as his son" (*op. cit.*, p. 60).—The text does not represent Abraham as rejoicing over the alleged spiritual awakening of the rich man. It does emphasize the "great gulf fixed between us and you."

17. The Hades theologians never fail to quote the passages proclaiming the universality of redemption and the universality of God's gracious will. Farrar: "My belief is fixed upon 'that living God,' who, we are told, is 'the Savior of all men,' . . . who willeth not that *any* should perish, 2 Pet. 3:9; Ezek. 33:11; Rom. 2:4; 1 Tim. 2:4" (*op. cit.*, p. 87 f.). *The Gospel of the Hereafter*: "The whole Gospel harmony of the early Church told of the universality of His atonement. It told of victory, far beyond this life. . . . It was one of the most triumphant notes in their Gospel—the wideness of Christ's atonement" (p. 61 f.). *The Pulpit Commentary*: "We know that the Lord Jesus Christ 'tasted death for every man.' . . . We feel sure that, in some way, and at some time, the gracious offer of salvation comes to every man in life or in death, in ways known or unknown" (p. 178). Ziethe: "He is the God not only of the Jews and the Christians, but also of the heathen. Verily, He is the God also of the Gentiles, as Paul declares Rom. 3:29" (*op. cit.*, p. 733). And L. Schneller adds this passage: "Therefore Ps. 139:8 declares: 'If I make my bed in hell, behold, Thou art there.' But if

He is in hell, He is there, too, what He always and everywhere has been, the God who would have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of truth." Farrar, too, quotes Ps. 139:8 as a prooftext (*op. cit.*, p. 22).—Scripture teaches these two truths: (a) Christ has redeemed all men, and God would have all men to be saved; (b) not all men are saved, subjectively. The argument, therefore, that because of the universality of redemption and of grace all men, at least most men, must be saved, subjectively, is unscriptural. Furthermore, if the argument were valid, logically, we would have universalism (apokatastasis). But the Hades theologians repudiate the apokatastasis gospel. Their position is doubly illogical in that they refuse to draw the full conclusion from their own argumentation and say with us: Though redemption is universal, only some are saved.

18. Additional arguments. Dorner: "The *absoluteness of Christianity* demands that no one be judged before Christianity has been made accessible and brought home to him." Quoted and approved by Luckock, p. 184, by Plumptre, p. 252, by Traub, p. 92, and others. Traub: "Because Christianity is the absolute religion, it is necessary that those who were not called in this life should receive the offer of salvation after this life."—What does "absoluteness of Christianity" mean? If it means that "there is no salvation except in Christ, through the Gospel, Acts 4:12: 'Neither is there salvation in any other'"—that is Traub's definition, and we accept this definition (see Pieper, *op. cit.*, p. 41; *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 1945, p. 50), then the argument based on the "absoluteness of Christianity" contains the same flaws as the universality argument (No. 16). Scripture teaches the "absoluteness of Christianity" and teaches at the same time that after death there is no offer of salvation, no probation. If "absoluteness of the Christian religion" has some hidden meaning, according to which he to whom "Christianity has not been brought home" is entitled to have it "brought home to him" in the future life, we do not know what that hidden meaning is.<sup>10)</sup>

19. Plumptre, page 102: "There seems reason to believe, as concerning the belief which prevailed among the Jews whom the Apostles addressed and which, so far as they do not protest against it, it may fairly be supposed they shared it, that there was an anticipation, more or less distinct, of the work which the Messiah was to carry to completion in that world of the souls of the dead."

---

10) What about those, the heathen, to whom Christianity "had not been made accessible" in this life? There is nothing in "the absoluteness of Christianity" which would demand that the Gospel be made accessible to them in "Hades." We shall discuss this case of the heathen in a later article.

Plumptre then submits quotations from Jewish writings. "Thus we read that 'the Son of David would pass through hell, to redeem those who were more under condemnation.' 'We rejoice over Thee to that time when the prisoners that are in hell (gehenna) shall be freed and shall come forth.'" — We cannot accept the canon that "the Apostles may fairly be supposed to share the belief which prevailed among the Jews, *so far as they do not protest against it*," in this general form. Having affirmed the thesis that there is no probation after death, the Apostles did not deem it necessary to discuss the antithesis.

20. "F. Delitzsch, in his *Biblical Psychology*, p. 553, says: 'We dare not place the limit' (beyond which atonement and conversion are no longer possible) 'arbitrarily at any point within the range of time. . . . So long as there is *time*, conversion must be possible, for it is actually the Christian idea of the significance of time that it is a period of trial and of grace; and as long as the sinner finds himself within the range of time, he exists under the long-suffering of God.' It is only when what we call time ceases with the *final advent of the Lord* that the state of the blessed and the condemned becomes, from his point of view, fixed forever" (see Plumptre, *op. cit.*, p. 259). — What? When a man departs this earthly life, he is still living *in time* up to the day of the final Judgment?

21. And now for the *sedes doctrinae* of the Hades gospel. The *sedes doctrinae* is man's notion that God's love and justice call for a second probation. The Hades theologians quote 1 Pet. 3:19 and 4:6 as their prooftexts, but take as their guide to the understanding of these texts their conception of how God should deal with men. Read the interpretation of *The Pulpit Commentary*, quoted under Argument 1. "It is impossible to believe that the Lord's preaching was a 'concio damnatoria.' The Lord spoke sternly sometimes in the days of His flesh, but it was the warning voice of love. It cannot be that the most merciful Savior, etc." Read again Dr. Scofield's interpretation. Read the interpretation of the Lange-Schaff Commentary: "Such dammatory preaching is derogatory to the character of the Redeemer; Christian consciousness revolts from the thought that the Holy Jesus, whose dying words were words of forgiveness and love, should have visited the realms of the dead and exulted over the misery of the damned. . . . The justice and love of God now appear to us in glorious light and withhold the definite sentence of condemnation until all men have decided with full consciousness concerning Christ and the Gospel." — And Farrar states frankly: "This my belief that He who is the Lord both of the dead and living, may save sinful souls even after the death of the body, is founded, not as has been

asserted, on two texts in St. Peter, but on what seems to me to be the general tenor of the entire Scriptures, as a revelation of the love of God in Christ" (italics in original). . . . "It is therefore a doctrine, not only in better accord with man's instinctive belief in the justice and mercy of God" (our italics), "but also far more Scriptural and far more catholic than the later views . . . these later and darker views" (*op. cit.*, pp. XIV, XVI).<sup>11</sup>

God's love and justice calls for salvation in Hades—that is the fundamental principle of the Gospel of the Hereafter. With one voice the Hades theologians proclaim it. Traub: "The love and righteousness of God demand—our faith and love, too, demand—that every man get the opportunity to decide for or against Christ, either in this life or after this life" (*op. cit.*, p. 91). Plumptre: "We thank God . . . that the natural instincts of men have risen up in revolt against conclusions so irreconcilably at variance with all belief in the love of Christ and the Fatherhood of God. . . . It is surely altogether monstrous to think that He who a short time before had breathed the prayer 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do' should pass into the world of the unseen only to tell the souls of the lost of a kingdom from which they were excluded" (*op. cit.*, pp. 11, 19). John Schmidt: "The eternal fate of those who have never been confronted by an effective choice" (our italics) "for or against Christ is another matter entirely, concerning which we can conclude only that God, who judges all men in accordance with their opportunities, will judge them also in love" (*The Riches of His Grace*, p. 155).

Tholuck finds that the justice of God absolutely calls for an intermediate state, for it would not square with the justice of God to have a wicked man who in this life came only in slight contact with the Gospel and so did not come to faith consigned at once to damnation (see Hoenecke, *op. cit.*, IV, p. 232). S. Baring-Gould: "God is just, and would it be just that hundreds of millions should be lost because they never had the chance?" (*Op. cit.*, p. 40.) *The Pulpit Commentary*: "All must have the Gospel preached to them, or the judgment would be partial, unjust, unrighteous" (p. 196). Plumptre: "Reason rose in rebellion against . . . a dogma that clashed with men's sense of equity" (*op. cit.*, p. 167). Luckock:

11) See also statements of the liberal theologian F. A. Loofs, quoted in G. O. Lillegard's article "The Idea of a Probation After Death" in the *Theological Quarterly*, 1919, p. 225. He rejects the Lutheran teaching on Christ's descent to hell, but admits that "it does justice to the text (1 Pet. 3:19) more than others" (*Third Congress for the History of Religions*, II, 291). In his article in Hasting's *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, on "The Descent to Hades," he denies that 1 Pet. 3:19 gives support to the usual doctrine of a probation after death, although he believes that this doctrine must on other grounds be conceded to be correct.

"God is a being of absolute justice. 'Justice and judgment are the habitation of Thy throne' (Ps. 89:14). 'Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?' (Gen. 18:25.) It was not till the great divines of the seventeenth century shook off the incubus that the Church emancipated itself from views that were most difficult to reconcile with principles of justice and right" (*op. cit.*, pp. 179, 181).

This last argument, the chief argument of the Hades theologians, is not Scriptural. Nowhere does Scripture indicate any such line of thought. Men derive this dogma from their reason, *their* sense of justice, *their* conception of mercy. And men have not the right to use the argument under discussion. For what it amounts to is this: reason presumes to tell God what He must do in order to retain His character as a merciful and just God. And shall reason teach God ethics? Presumptuous reason is telling God that unless He conducts His judgment according to human standards, His conduct would be unfair, partial, unrighteous, unethical.—Professor Briggs declared, in so many words, that the ethics of God, Christian ethics, and the ethics of humankind must be brought into agreement. (See *Lehre und Wehre*, 1893, p. 165.) To be sure, man's ethics must be regulated by God's ethics. But that is not what Professor Briggs meant.

Will a man judge God? There are cases where we cannot understand God's ways. When "God gives His Word at one place but not at another," and when He gives one man less opportunities than another, blind reason agrees that God is disregarding the principles of justice and love, but the Christian faith is humble and knows how to keep silence. Christian faith declares: "How unsearchable are His judgments!" (Rom. 11:33.) "O man, who art thou that repliest against God?" (Rom. 9:20.)

One thing we know, and that is that "God is a Being of absolute justice. 'Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?'" But while Luckock would establish God's absolute justice by making it conform to his human ideas of justice, we tell our reason when it finds fault with God's ways: Whatever God does, is right, for He is a Being of absolute justice. In one thing we rejoice, and that is the declaration of our Lord and Savior that He loves the world and would have all men to be saved. And we shall not permit Satan to quote to us the Scriptural truth that there is no salvation after death in order to make God a liar.<sup>12)</sup>

12) We are glad to quote the following from Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*: "The assumption that the Gospel is preached in an intermediate state is based on the very questionable interpretation of a single Bible passage; it is hard to make it agree with various other passages (2 Cor. 5:10; Gal. 6:8; Rom. 2:6; Matth. 25:41 ff.; Heb. 9:27; etc.); and the plea that this assumption is needed in order to vindicate the principle of divine justice and love is altogether unwarranted" (*loc. cit.*).

A final remark. Kliefoth tells us that not all will be converted in Hades (see P. Althaus, *Die letzten Dinge*, p. 181). And that may be the case, because, as others tell us, conversion in Hades is more difficult than here. What, then, becomes of those who are not converted in Hades? According to the principles of love and justice, as applied by the Hades theologians, would God not be obliged to provide a second Hades with still more effective preaching and then a third<sup>13)</sup> and then finally employ the conditions in hell to bring about the eternal salvation of all? Universalism, using this same twenty-first argument, argues that God's love cannot permit any man to be lost eternally. And if the Hades theologians were true to the principle of "God's love and justice," they would have to exchange the Hades gospel for the apokatas-tasis gospel.

Are we willing to preach, on the basis of these twenty-one arguments, assertions, and guesses, the Hades gospel?

TH. ENGELDER

## The Lord's Prayer, the Pastor's Prayer

### The Second Petition

The Kingdom is the kingdom of the Father, for the Father is addressed. And since Jesus teaches us to pray for the coming of the Father's kingdom, the Father must have a kingdom. This argument is sustained by the conclusion of the prayer: Thine is the Kingdom. Since the Father has a kingdom, He is a King. Though He is the King, we are to approach Him as our Father. Jesus teaches us to believe with a rejoicing heart that we are children of a king and encourages us to seek better acquaintance with, and greater knowledge of, the King and the Kingdom.

For the past century theologians and philosophers have lectured and written extensively and with undiminished zeal on the subject of the Kingdom of God, and not without influence. A review of the material produced is beyond the purpose of today's program. Yet we would say that countless human notions have been attached to the Kingdom of God. The many concepts advanced do not confuse the Lutheran pastor who faithfully searches

---

13) We have lately read that in an article published in the *Christian Advocate*, "The World to Come," Edwin Lewis, after stating that Scripture does not teach "that every man's eternal destiny is fixed at the moment of his death," says: "What we surmise is that between this world and the next—and the next—and the next—is moral continuity" (see the *Christian Beacon*, Aug. 19, 1943). What was it that the Swedenborgians say about the spirits being led from one society to another?

the *principium cognoscendi*. This he applies to all concepts presented to him; and when he has mentally classified them, he will file each repetition on the shelf for trends. We speak of mere trends, because the clear-cut, scholarly, and above all, the simple Scriptural definition of the Kingdom is impossible and must end hopelessly in hazy paradoxes when the divine revelation is brushed aside or misapplied. Let us at this time ascertain for what we pray in the Second Petition.

No man has seen the Father-King at any time; the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, has declared Him. And the Holy Spirit has revealed the Father's person, His face, appearance, attributes, His throne of light, His works, His glory. Now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face. Now we know in part; but then shall we know even as also we are known. The revelation pertaining to the kingdom of the Father requires faith. The doctrine of the Father's kingdom is an article of faith. Thy Kingdom Come: "Father, teach me to believe whatever Thou hast revealed of Thyself as King and of Thy Kingdom, and strengthen in me that faith." This is the pastor's prayer.

The Bible teaches a threefold kingdom of the Father: the kingdom of power, the kingdom of grace, and the kingdom of glory. Where should we begin in our meditation on the Kingdom? We must begin where the revelation of the Father and the revelation of His kingdom begins. It begins in a person, namely, in the only-begotten Son of the Father, who has declared Him. He is the Beginning and the End. We begin at Jesus Christ. He has told us so much about the Father and His kingdom. He says: "All things are delivered unto Me of My Father; and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." This remarkable statement is found in a context which has particular value for our meditation. Matt. 11:25-30. Jesus addresses the Father and calls Him the Lord of heaven and earth. Accordingly, heaven and earth are the Father's kingdom. The Father's peculiar government is hidden by the Father to the wise and prudent, yet revealed by Him to babes who are then designated as they that labor and are heavy laden. The Father has revealed "these things," His government and divine aims and purposes, through the Son, to whom He has delivered all things. The Son reveals these things to the laboring and heavy laden by the invitation of the Gospel. His government is hidden under His grace as under a blanket.

The unbeliever rejects the Son and His revelation of the Father and thus makes it impossible for himself to discern "these things," in particular the end and aim of God's government. Or has anyone yet found the Father without first seeing the Son? The

kingdom of power, which is also delivered to the Son by the Father, reveals God as the almighty, the all-wise, the benevolent God, but not God as our Father. The task of revealing God as the Father was placed upon Jesus when all things were delivered to Him, and henceforth we read the marvelous execution of the Father's act recorded in Ps. 8: "Thou madest Him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands; Thou hast put all things under His feet." The Child born unto us, the Son given unto us, upholds all things by the word of His power. He says: "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth." "The Father loveth the Son and hath given all things into His hand." "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into His hands, and that He was come from God and went to God" . . . He washed the feet of His disciples. Jesus prays: "Glorify Thy Son that Thy Son also may glorify Thee: as Thou hast given Him power over all flesh that He should give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given Him." And we read with great joy and adoration the grand and majestic proclamation at Col. 1:12-22. The Son is co-Regent with the Father, and He reigns jointly with Him in full agreement and undisturbed harmony toward the purposes divinely decreed by the wisdom, and designed by the knowledge, of God. Therefore, if we would know for what we pray in the Second Petition, we must begin at Christ, the King of Kings and the Lord of Lords, and we must begin at the grace and truth of King Christ. The meaning of the Second Petition is: "Father, cause Thy Son to come to us as our King; not Thy kingdom merely without the King, but by the King Thy kingdom." That is the pastor's prayer.

The King established His kingdom by His grace, founded it upon His grace, rules it by His grace, builds and extends it by His grace through the Word of grace. His grace sends the Spirit of Grace, who glorifies the Son as the King of Grace, and the Kingdom as the kingdom of grace, and who gathers the subjects to become the recipients and beneficiaries of the King's grace. The sending of His Son is an act of the Father's grace; the coming of the Son is His act of grace; the invitation to come to the Son is the Holy Spirit's act of grace. See John 6:37-47. Therefore the Second Petition expresses the sincere desire: "O Father, draw me to the Savior, that Thy dear Son may draw me unto Thee." And that is the pastor's prayer.

And when we have been drawn to the King and with honest astonishment look and move about in the Kingdom, we note that the nature of the Kingdom is spiritual, though it is on earth. The coming of the Kingdom is spiritual, though in relation to time and space. The extent of the Kingdom is spiritual, but restricted to the boundaries of the earth. The purpose and aim of the Kingdom is

spiritual, and it includes eternity. Its citizenship is spiritual, though it is held by mortals. The benefits are spiritual, but embrace also the temporal. The protection and defense is spiritual, but it affects the entire world: all social, political, scientific, economic conditions; for all things must serve the kingdom of grace. The kingdom of grace is the seat of the King's government for the duration, not the kingdom of glory; just as the courtroom, and not the home, is the king's official place. According to the King's own statement, Matt. 18:15-20, John 20:21-23, His seat of gracious operations is at St. John's Lutheran Church, at Grace Lutheran Church, at Trinity Lutheran Church, at Faith Lutheran Church, in fact, wherever the one holy Christian Church is to be found. Pastors, rejoice, rejoice! The Second Petition encourages us to pray: "Our Father, help us to know and to appreciate Thy kingdom and to display a sincere loyalty to it and to respect Thy local congregations and their administration of the Office of the Keys." And that is the pastor's prayer.

The kingdom of grace is the Church on earth. The King calls it the kingdom of heaven in contrast to the kingdoms of the earth. By dogmatic teaching, by parable, by His work of redemption, the King has revealed everything pertaining to the Kingdom with the purpose of saving us. We cannot pray this petition without the sense of inexpressible gratitude. As the pastor prays, he praises.

*Elthato* (imperative aorist): The coming is viewed as one act. But we may well say that the coming of the Father's kingdom is an uninterrupted series of completed acts. Our coming to the conference, for instance, is a series of completed single steps and of completed single turns of the automobile wheels. The concept of coming is a movement, sometimes by descent, sometimes by ascent, sometimes by meeting, sometimes by overtaking, depending on the point from which the approach is being made or observed. The Father's kingdom moves as it comes. It moves to us from heaven, "without our prayer," by the operations of the Holy Spirit on earth through Christ and His Gospel. Mark 1:14, 15; John 3:5, 8. One by one each miraculous conversion is effected; one by one the kingdom of the Father grows. The Pharisee asked, "When cometh the kingdom of heaven?" It comes when and where Jesus approaches the sinner with His Gospel. At conversion the devil is cast out, and Jesus says: "But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you," Matt. 12:28. We pray in the Second Petition that Jesus may cast out the devil from us and others by the Spirit of God. This is personal. When the individual Christian among us was converted, the Kingdom of God had come to him; in his person another citizen was born into the Father's kingdom. We desire to remain loyal and steadfast. We are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation.

Our ordination and call into the ministry is not a means of grace, nor a guarantee for our personal salvation. We pray in this petition that the Father would graciously by ever-repeated action of His grace keep us in His kingdom and gather and confirm more citizens. And that is the pastor's prayer.

To the question of His enemies Jesus replies: "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation. Neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, Lo there! for, behold, the Kingdom of God is *entes hymon*." Luke 17:20, 21. The Kingdom of God is here, in your midst. It exists among you. You are in its presence. He implies: You know it not. They expected pomp and splendor. But they saw only a person in the form of a servant, who humbled Himself and became obedient unto the death of the Cross. They saw Him only as a grain of wheat. They saw Him fondle little children and infants. They saw Him eat and drink with the sinners. And they were offended. Jesus says to another enemy: My kingdom is not of this world. To all the enemies of the Kingdom the King issues the warning: "The Kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof," Matt. 21:43. The opposite of coming is going, departing. Thy Kingdom Come: that is, "Father, suffer us not to provoke Thee to depart from us; cause Thy kingdom to abide among us and in us, and grant unto us the power and grace to bring forth the fruits thereof. Help us always to believe Thy holy Word and to lead a godly life according to it." And that is the pastor's prayer for himself and his congregation.

Some mortals almost entered the Kingdom. To a scribe Jesus said: "Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God": Thou art in its proximity, but not in it, and therefore still outside of it. This man reminds us of the nominal Christian. Another man was about to look back because of earthly considerations, and he heard the King say: "No man, having put his hand to the plow, and looking back, is fit for the Kingdom of God." And we are reminded of those who in their demand for social activities forget that the Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but that it is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. Paul had occasion to reprimand those who are puffed up: The Kingdom of God is not in word, but in power. It is not in many wise men after the flesh, not in many mighty, not in many noble, but in the foolish and weak things, which is a comfort to the humble pastor. Thy Kingdom Come: "Father, keep me foolish and weak; and keep my brethren foolish and weak; and make others foolish and weak; that we may not oppose or hinder the coming of Thy kingdom by any love of the world or the things that are in the world." And this is the pastor's prayer.

The Father's kingdom has enemies who would in violent dis-

agreement and brutal opposition arrest it in its course, prevent its growth and extension, and finally destroy it. These enemies are Satan, the world, and the flesh. Their method of warfare varies at times and places. And there are some who deny the existence of the Kingdom. They maintain that the Church is built on a fantasy, and that the Kingdom is a utopian dream, and that dreams are often more powerful than realities. They say that the Kingdom exists only in the minds of the believers. Strange! What possesses their own minds that they should go to all their trouble and bitter toil to fight a fantasm, if the Kingdom of God is only a dream? Others argue on the strength of this petition, wrongfully, that divine revelation is progressive, and thus they hope by and by to possess fully the Kingdom of God. They fail to recognize the Savior-King. But on the basis of Scripture we believe in the Kingdom's existence, permanence, and duration. It teaches that there is never a time when the Kingdom of God will not come or when it does not exist or function or when the gates of hell do prevail against it. The foul opposition of the enemies is a challenge to us to implore the Triune God: Thy Kingdom Come. This petition is our battle cry. And the Kingdom of God comes with such crushing blows to the opposing kingdoms that finally they will all lie in a heap. Ps. 145:10-14; 45:6. "The Kingdom ours remaineth." Phil. 2:10, 11. *Vexilla Regis possunt fluitare contra ventos.* — The petition is directed to the Father against the enemies in behalf of the enemies. And that is the pastor's prayer.

The King says: Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom. Luke 12:32. Again Jesus employs the aorist to describe the Father's act of giving membership in the Kingdom to individual persons, not to the masses as such. The masses hear the Gospel. Individuals reject it. Individuals are converted. Scripture does not condemn, but encourages, every legitimate effort of the Kingdom's citizens to reach the masses and to snatch them from the tight grip of the enemies; yet they are to observe the principle of individual and personal acceptance of each new citizen. Though we cannot convert anyone into the Kingdom, but must wait for the Holy Spirit to perform that divine, gracious act, yet the Father has given each and every one of us the task to bear the means of conversion into the entire world, to every home, to every person. Jesus, praying this petition in His own way and version, prays not only for the Apostles, but for them also which shall believe on Him through their word, namely, through the Gospel, which they and all Christians should preach, as heralds of the King, to every creature individually rather than collectively, giving attention to each (*pase te ktisei*). By the Word, which is not bound, the Kingdom is extended. The rain

and snow is used by the King (Is. 55) to illustrate the coming and success of His Word. The Kingdom of God comes by means of His Word, as it were, in single drops that collectively form the rain, in single flakes that collectively form the snowfall: Here a sermon, there a testimony, now a Bible verse, then a hymn, a tract, a Sunday school lesson, all based on the sound Gospel. This petition is the missionary prayer. It should be in our hearts and on our lips from morning till evening. By it we affectionately embrace our own congregation, and compassionately press to our heart the entire world, and present them both, in dire need of spiritual refreshing, peace, and salvation, to the heavenly Father and King. And when we pastors pray this petition, let us build and promote the Kingdom of God according to His divine principles: the kingdom of peace in peace, the kingdom of joy cheerfully, the spiritual kingdom free of the care of "these things" which shall be added unto us, the kingdom of righteousness in a God-pleasing, brotherly, righteous manner, the kingdom of order with the observance of pastoral ethics, the kingdom of grace without an eye to reward, the kingdom of truth without the lie and despair of anti-Scriptural philosophy. And the pastor must ask himself: Do I preach to live, or do I live to preach? Do I ask that *I* come and prosper or that the Father's *kingdom* come and prosper? Let us remember that by this petition we rule the world as co-regents — we say it with humble gratitude — with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. We pray in this petition: "Suffer us not to be remiss in our duty and privilege to rule the world with Thee, but help us to perform the functions of our office as kings and priests and heralds." And this is the pastor's prayer.

When others besides the pastors of the Missouri Synod pray this petition in its Scriptural setting and spirit, then it becomes the unifying petition. And if anyone prays against a God-pleasing Lutheran unity, he prays the Second Petition hypocritically. We circumscribe and paraphrase this petition with Johann Heermann: "Preserve Thy little flock in peace, nor let Thy boundless mercy cease; to all the world let it appear that Thy true Church indeed is here." And that is the pastor's prayer.

In the meantime God's kingdom of power serves His kingdom of grace. Whether we live under a good or intolerant national government, in prosperity or depression, in peace or war, in abundance or want: all things work together for the good of the Father's kingdom and its citizens. Paul is an example. To arrest the course of the Kingdom, the enemies cast the Apostle into prison, confining him and the Word of the kingdom within dank walls. What happens? The Holy Spirit inspires him to write, and now the inspired Word of the Kingdom pierces the walls and reaches through the ages the hearts beating today. God's power

is in the service of His grace. Our Imperial Valley is another example. In earlier centuries this valley was covered by the sea. God called the ocean back and laid bare the fertile land. While man now tills the soil there and builds cities, God builds His kingdom there. Our prayer is: "Father, rule Thy kingdom of power in behalf of Thy kingdom of grace."

The Father's kingdom is a social community. Each citizen has his task to perform for the benefit of all and to the glory of the King: the pastor, the professor, the teacher, the elder, the man, the woman, and the child. 1 Cor. 12. And the Kingdom is a flock and a family. No member has a right selfishly to seek a better living where the Kingdom is not, and then expect the fellow Christians at their expense of manpower, missionary power, missionary funds, to supply his spiritual needs, which he deliberately neglected by seeking first "all these things." If the Father extends His kingdom to such a prodigal, He glorifies it again as the kingdom of grace. Well does Luther stress under this petition the importance of a godly life. We must not betray and deny by an ungodly life the King and His kingdom. Our preaching by example is observed by more people than our preaching by word of mouth. Thy Kingdom Come: "Father, help us all to be good and faithful citizens, who loyally support by word, life, and deed, and never hinder by selfishness or fear, the course of Thy kingdom." And that is the pastor's prayer.

The Father hears and answers our prayer. He leads us to, or sends to us, mission material. We see in anticipation and hope a larger membership, a growing congregation. We visit, plan, instruct diligently, indoctrinate faithfully, we baptize, confirm — and then our sheaves shift to another location! How discouraging! No, not at all discouraging. For we must learn to serve for the building, for the coming, of the Kingdom as well as to labor for an increased local membership. Some smaller congregations are, proportionately, a greater power in the Kingdom than some larger ones. When members leave to join a sister congregation, they take the Kingdom with them. Nevertheless the Kingdom remains with us. The pastor prays: "Dear Father, do Thou build and extend Thy kingdom by blessing my efforts as Thy ambassador and co-worker, and my congregation's Christian endeavors, to be a power at home and abroad; help me to know and believe that my labor is not in vain in the Lord." That is the pastor's prayer.

"Then cometh the end," 1 Cor. 15:24-28. When the Kingdom shall have ceased coming, it will cease as that kingdom of grace which we knew here on earth. Its purposes accomplished, its glorious aims attained, its last business done, it will be dissolved. This act of the King completes the kingdom of glory, described in Revelation. The kingdom of grace, having been delivered to the

Father, has no further need of a King. The citizens of the kingdom of glory are the sainted conquerors and overcomers. They will be subject to God, who is all in all. And inasmuch as the Son is and ever remains the Head of the Church, He will as such be subject to God without in the least disturbing the Trinitarian relation. Divine revelation says nothing about an earthly millennium. We shy away from the millennial dream as from the devil's snare. This petition is our eschatological prayer. It revives and strengthens, not by our act of praying, but by its objective doctrine, our hope that the Lord shall deliver us from every evil work and shall preserve us unto His heavenly kingdom; to whom be glory forever and ever.

Los Angeles, Calif.

G. H. SMUKAL

## **Outlines on Gospels Adopted by Synodical Conference**

### **Second Sunday after Trinity**

**John 8:1-11**

When David had been delivered from his enemies and, in particular, from the hand of Saul, he wrote Psalm 18. The words of this day's Introit are taken from that Psalm, and they express our reaction whenever we consider God's goodness in delivering us from the hands of them that oppress us. In our text of today we have an example of such a deliverance, for herein we behold

#### **The Victorious Christ Dealing with Sinful Mankind**

##### *1. He gains the victory over His adversaries.*

A. The scribes and Pharisees, seeking His destruction, John 7:1, 25, 32, 45 ff., tempt Him "that they might have to accuse Him," v. 6.

Early in the morning Jesus, seated in the Temple, is teaching a large multitude, v. 2, when the scribes and Pharisees bring a woman into the midst "taken in adultery," v. 3, "in the very act," v. 4. Thus they place a problem before Him which evidently appears to them as offering Him an inescapable dilemma. Should He decide for the execution of the Law as demanded by Moses (Lev. 20:10; Deut. 22: 22-24; Lev. 10: 9) and by Ezekiel (Ezek. 16: 38-40), He would place Himself in jeopardy with regard to the law of the Romans and could be accused of inciting rebellion. On the other hand, should He decide against carrying out the Mosaic statute, He could be charged with a disavowal of His own statements (Matt. 5: 17-19) and with failure to re-establish the Law, to do what was expected of the Messiah.

B. At first the Savior seems deliberately to ignore their question, v. 6, but when they continue asking Him, v. 7, He replies:

a. by calling attention to their own sinfulness, v. 7 (Greek: "The sinless one among you, let him start the throwing"). He thus disarms them, for which of them was ready to designate anyone of their own number as "the sinless one"?

b. By reversing the situation He places them into the very dilemma into which they thought to put Him. By the statement, v. 7 (pres. imper. Lit., "start throwing"), He compels them either to initiate the execution of the Mosaic Law at once and thus to jeopardize themselves with Rome or to refuse and thus to expose the utter insincerity of their first question before the multitude, v. 5.

C. The scribes and Pharisees do the only thing for them under the circumstances, v. 9, and so Christ emerges victorious over His adversaries.

How good to know that this Jesus is with His Church always, Matt. 28: 20, guiding Her by His supreme wisdom and power, assuring her that "the gates of hell shall not prevail"! Matt. 16:18; Ps. 18:2; Ps. 46; and Hymn 262:2 (*The Lutheran Hymnal*). Do we realize and appreciate this sufficiently?

*2. In His victory He delivers a most unworthy sinner.*

A. The adulterous woman of our text was a most guilty sinner, vv. 3, 4, 11, and deserved the sentence of death, v. 5, as Jesus acknowledges, v. 7.

B. But Jesus delivers her from public shame by calling attention to the universal guilt of sin in all present, v. 7; from the sentence of death, which she deserved, vv. 9-11; and from a future life of sin with its final condemnation, for He shows her what she might do in appreciation for His kindness, v. 11.

C. Jesus delivers her for His name's sake, even as He has promised to deliver all who put their trust in Him, for He had been anointed "to set at liberty them that are bruised," Luke 4:16-21; Is. 61; to "seek and save that which was lost," Luke 19:10; "that the world through Him might be saved," John 3:17.

D. How consoling to know that Jesus delivers even the lowliest of sinners, calling them to His great Supper of Grace (The Gospel, Luke 14: 21)! For which of us is not equally guilty in God's eyes and equally unworthy? Luke 12: 47, 48; Is. 53: 6; Rom. 3: 9, 23; Matt. 5: 28.

Surely this woman must have rejoiced at her deliverance. And shall not we rejoice over the daily deliverance which comes from Him who "justifieth the ungodly," Rom. 4:5? who "delivered me because He delighted in me," Ps. 18:19? Let us show our joy by practicing His kind of love toward one another (Cp. the Epistle, 1 John 3:16-18) and thus say with the Introit, "I will love Thee, O Lord, my Strength." Amen.

THEODORE F. NICKEL

**Third Sunday after Trinity****Luke 15:11-32**

The four characters in this most beautiful short story ever written are: the lost son, the friends of the son, the forgiving father, and the self-righteous, loveless brother. They are with us today. Which do we resemble?

**God's Way with His Erring Children in Contrast to Man's Way**

1. *In the battle against sin*
2. *In the return from sin*

**1**

A. God's way. God gives blessings for body and soul in lavish measure. The hired servants were well provided, v. 17; the son much more so. As this father exercised wholesome discipline in the home, later recalled by the son, vv. 18, 19, so God warns and keeps His children from sin.

If you have not fallen like the prodigal, God's grace alone has kept you.

If you have sinned like the prodigal, the fault is yours, not God's. Say: "I have sinned."

B. Man's way. There were plenty of "friends" who lured the wayward son to a life of riot and waste, leading to ruin of body and soul. You do the same when you encourage that "little friendly game" for money, the intoxicating glass, the intimate association with loose company.

Vv. 14-16. Famine and want brought no friends near—his pockets were empty! They used him until he was of no use to them. No pity or kindness for the starving, desperate down-and-outer. "What is that to us?" Go and feed swine, but you can't have swine fodder for yourself! Coldhearted, loveless man has no remedy for the anguish of an accusing conscience. Matt. 27:4.

Is your way with the sinner Godlike? Or can some wayward son or daughter point the accusing finger at you, saying that you coaxed them downgrade? Can you look unmoved on the sinner polluted in his own blood, Ezek. 16: 6, and pass by on the other side?

Teach me the wayward feet to stay  
And guide them in the homeward way.

**2**

A. God's love still pursues the sinner in his shame and misery.  
Vv. 17-19. Starvation and degradation. Prov. 13:15.

He came to himself. Had he thought only of his sin and misery, he would have despaired. One step from despair to suicide. But he thought also of the loving care of his father. Conscience condemned, but memory brought back the picture of home and love.

That love made him homesick. The Gospel of God's love is powerful even in remembrance, after years of forgetting.

Drawn with the cords of love, he arose — no longer "down" — and came to his father. The world does nothing to start the wayward sinner homeward, Godward. God does everything. Am I doing God's work?

V. 20. The father longingly looked out for his son. He ran to meet him, embraced and kissed him, "kissed the past into forgottenness." Forgiveness before confession!

God, "whose heart with pity still doth break whether we seek Him or forsake," is slow to anger, but swift to show mercy. Ps. 145:8.

What the returning prodigal said, v. 21, was true. The father did not minimize his son's wrongdoing, v. 24. He forgave him. He was so overjoyed at his son's return that he spread a banquet in which his whole household was to share and to make merry.

That is God's way of welcoming the returning sinner and making him glad with the joy in the matchless grace of a forgiving God. V. 10.

B. Men too often behave like the elder brother, vv. 28-30. He is proud, sullen, self-righteous. In spite of the prodigal's repentance, it is "this thy son," not *my brother*. Suppose the prodigal had met his elder brother first!

Lack of humility and love will make even church members act like the elder brother. They forget that by forgetting God they, too, wandered into a far country.

May we appreciate the grace of God which stooped just as low to save and enrich us as it does to rescue and lift up the prodigal sons and daughters of our day. Then we will imitate God's way of welcoming the sinner and Christ's way (vv. 1-3, 28-32) of pleading with the self-righteous.

V. L. MEYER

#### Fourth Sunday after Trinity

Matt. 7:1-6

Our Synod's mission among the blind may be taken as a parable of all our church work. What is our business but to help the "blind" to see the Light of the world? The old Gospel for this Sunday has the ever relevant warning of Jesus about "the blind leaders of the blind." Also in our text Jesus teaches us

#### Our Need of Clear Vision

1. *As keepers of our brother*
2. *As keepers of a holy treasure*

## 1

A. "Am I my brother's keeper?" "Yes," says he who through Jesus has found the Father. Augustine's dictum about God "Always active, always tranquil," with the clauses reversed, describes the Christian. Because "tranquil" (Luke 6:36; Matt. 6:24-34), he is active in loving service (7:12, 17). He sees himself as his brother's keeper both as to his body (Matt. 25:35, 36) and as to his soul, rendering him the loving service of brotherly admonition.

B. Our duty to our brother, and the way to its performance, is first shown negatively by its perversion (vv. 1-4); for alas! as in Jesus' days, so with us the perversion is better known than the true practice. The "judging" prohibited, v. 1 ("Don't pose as judges"), is illustrated by a proverb (v. 3) which seems to have been current like ours about "those who live in glass houses." Grotesque like a cartoon, it reveals the hypocrisy of the "blind" oculists, the ancient and modern Pharisees, who measure progress in religion by severity in judging — self? No, others. Especially repugnant is this judging when it is practiced with the air of fraternal concern (v. 4), while the only motive is self-love: running others down in order to expand the ego. The "mote" in a particular case may be only a fancied one; and though real, the blind oculist is the last one who is able to help. Often it is the case of "the big thief hanging the little thief." Note that "mote" and "beam" are of the same vegetable matter. In every case the self-righteous, loveless judge through his very pride and uncharitableness has in his eye a "beam" which totally blinds spiritual vision. What damage these blind oculists have wrought; and not least of all to themselves, calcifying their own heart and putting into the hands of the Eternal Judge a measure of judgment which will be as stern as theirs, yet just. Vv. 1, 2; James 2:13.

C. V. 5. Luke 4:23. Self-judgment is the prerequisite for effective spiritual service to others. Such judgment in the light of Christ's trenchant interpretation of the Law (Matt. 5) leads to the prayer 6:12 a; to adoration of divine mercy (1 Tim. 1:15: "chief of sinners"); to a merciful estimate and treatment of others' faults. (Study Gal. 6:1; Rom. 15:1; James 5:20; Lev. 19:17; Ps. 141:5; Prov. 25:12; 27:6). Let us have no unmerciful judgment among us, but much more fraternal admonition. "Love buildeth up" (1 Cor. 8:1) — the love that in humble self-judgment has cleared the vision and through experience of God's mercy has received a tender hand for the delicate operation of helping remove the brother's "mote."

## 2

A. With clear vision we should daily examine our riches in Christ, "the Kingdom of God and His righteousness" (6:33), with all the attendant blessings; each item "holy," each a "pearl." The clearer this vision, the more eager we shall be to share our holy treasure with others. Shared joys, double joys. He who has love in his heart has spurs in his side. Matt. 5:13-16. This evangelization is to be world wide.

B. As keepers of a holy treasure, however, we need also the clear vision which sees that the Gospel cannot be applied where the Law has not done its work. When an unbeliever continues in his rejection of the Gospel, when he persists in his wicked life, when he shows that he has as little regard for the Savior and His Gospel as dogs have for holy things and swine have for pearls, then we must tell him Mark 16:16. So Christ did, Matt. 10:14, 15; Luke 23:8, 9; so Paul did, Acts 13:45, 46; 28:25-28. Also in church discipline there is a necessary final step when the former brother must be told that he is henceforth regarded a heathen man and publican until he repents.

Conclusion: The need of prayer that we be both keepers of our brethren and keepers of holy things. Mark 10:51.

V. BARTLING

### Fifth Sunday after Trinity

John 1:43-51

Our text presents the sequel of several episodes, each of which was of great importance in the early ministry of Jesus. We have there the brief, but comprehensive sermon of John the Baptist: "Behold the Lamb of God." We have the account of the first meeting between Christ, on the one hand, and Andrew, Peter, and John, on the other. These episodes already establish what is brought out strongly in our text:

#### The Wonderful Relation Between Jesus and His Disciples

1. *He seeks and finds them*
2. *They accept Him as Savior and Master*
3. *He assures them of His abiding presence*

## 1

a. Jesus *finds* Philip, the historic present emphasizing the gracious patience of the Lord. He addresses a simple invitation to him: "Follow Me!" The Savior's interest in gaining this man for His kingdom brought out very strongly. V. 43.

b. Jesus saw Nathanael coming toward Him and immediately characterized him in a manner that showed the truth of the remark

in chap. 2:25. He, the omniscient Son of God, searches the hearts of men, revealing to them the innermost secrets of their mind, with a view to gaining them for Himself. V. 47.

c. To this day the Lord seeks men through the Word, whose preaching should always be the foremost activity of every faithful pastor, as well as of parents in the home and Christians in general. He wants men everywhere to become His own and live under Him in His kingdom, etc.

## 2

a. Philip was won by the simple invitation of Christ, possibly having been prepared by the other men who had spent some time with the Lord. V. 43 b. He accepted the Savior so wholeheartedly that he at once became a missionary, equipped with an enthusiastic testimony based on the fulfillment of the ancient Messianic prophecies. V. 44 f. And he clung to his witness in spite of Nathanael's skeptical remark. V. 46.

b. The doubts of Nathanael were completely overcome by the words of Christ which so completely revealed His omniscience. Therefore he also voiced his acceptance of Jesus as the Son of God and the King of Israel. V. 49.

c. This is again and again the gracious consequence of the Gospel proclamation. People everywhere are gained for Christ, to accept Him as the promised Redeemer and as their Master, being convinced by the Word of truth, which in itself works faith. Hence the need of enthusiastic mission work, with the full proclamation of the Gospel.

## 3

a. In a way, the revelation of Himself in the few words addressed to Philip and then to Nathanael was the most overwhelming assurance that the Lord was interested in the soul's salvation of these men, whom He here called as His disciples and later also made Apostles. This interest was especially evident in the declaration of v. 50 cp. with v. 48. The same holds true with regard to every person in the world. The omnipresence and the omniscience of Christ emphasized again and again, as in Ps. 139. This a matter of great comfort to every believer.

b. The abiding presence of the Savior is emphasized especially in His last declaration, v. 51. Using phrases taken from the story of Jacob in the Old Testament, Gen. 28:12, He assures the newly won disciples that He, in His ministry among men, would be in the closest relation with His heavenly Father. And He here uses the significant term "Son of Man" for the first time, a designation which truly brings out the divine-human character of the Lord and brings Him and His saving grace close to the heart of every believer at all times.

P. E. KRETZMANN

---

## Miscellanea

---

### Simplicity and Clearness of Language in the Presentation of Religious Truth

Books on the technique of literary composition and on public speaking demand that a writer or speaker use simple and clear language. "Good speech is direct, practical, and simple. . . . It is a well-known fact that modern speaking has turned its back on what had been called the 'exuberant rhetoric of the Ciceronian tradition.' . . . The sonorous platitudes and highly decorated passages of a few generations past survive only in political oratory of low degree and in some oratorical contests. . . . The truth is that great speakers in all ages have been relatively simple in their diction. The simplest, most ordinary words have a communication value which is much greater than that of unusual and bombastic ones." (*Principles of Effective Speaking*. By Sandford and Yeager. Pp. 220, 221.) "Words from the everyday vocabulary, simplicity and directness of phrase, a strong and pointed sentence structure, an ordering of parts made lucid by marked indications of plan and consecutiveness, reasoning where there is only one step from premise to conclusion and no solution is left obscure or in long suspense—these are the economizing agencies which adapt oratorical style to popular apprehension." (Genung, quoted by Winans in *Public Speaking*, p. 163.) "Facts and ideas should be expressed as simply as possible. Pretentious style should be avoided. . . . Ideas must be expressed clearly and precisely; all vague or ambiguous constructions must be avoided." (*The Technique of Composition*. By Taft, McDermott, and Jensen. Pp 291, 334.) "Just as there are three qualities of a good organization—unity, coherence, and emphasis—so there are three qualities of a good style—clearness, ease, and energy. We should employ the word, the phrase, and the sentence that will best serve these three qualities. For example, clearness is aided if we use familiar words; that is, words which are bearers of meaning for the audience." (*Public Speaking for College Students*. By Crocker. P. 253.) "Avoid the use of lofty and high-sounding language to express simple thoughts." "It is the *homely* word, not the *learned* word, that goes straight to the imagination and the heart." (*Composition for College Students*. By Thomas, Manchester, and Scott. Pp. 540, 209.)

In this connection we may also be reminded that simplicity and harmony are the two qualities that make a thing beautiful, whether that be in a woman's manner of dressing, in the arrangement of a room in our home, or in a speech or a sermon.

Because of its importance, religious truth, and all that is connected therewith, should be presented in simple and clear language. If words are used that the common man does not understand, or if a matter is not clearly presented, one might just as well speak in a foreign tongue. "If I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me.

. . . In the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue," says Paul. (1 Cor. 14:11, 19.)

Speaking of the literary qualities of the King James Version of the Bible, McAfee says, "The first thing that attracts attention is its use of words, and since words lie at the root of all literature, it is worth while to stop for them for a moment. Two things are to be said about the words: first, that they are few; and, secondly, that they are short. The vocabulary of the English Bible is not an extensive one. . . . In the whole of the King James Version there are only about six thousand different words. . . . The words are short. . . . Short words are strong words. They have a snap and a grip to them that long words have not. Very few men would grow angry over having a statement called a 'prevarication' or 'a disingenuous entanglement of ideas,' but there is something about the word 'lie' that snaps in a man's face. 'Unjustifiable hypothecation' may be the same as stealing, but it would never excite one to be called 'an unjustifiable hypothecator' as it does to be called a thief. At the very foundation of the strength of the literature of the English Bible there lies this tendency to short, clear-cut words." (*The Greatest English Classic*, pp. 105, 106, 109.)

"Die vornehmste Frucht und Nutz der Dialectica ist, ein Ding fein rund, kurz und eigentlich definieren und beschreiben, was es gewisz ist. Darum soll man sich gewoehnen zu guten, rechtschaffenen, vernehmlichen Worten, die im gemeinen Brauch sind und ein Ding eigentlich und verstaendlich anzeigen und geben; welches eine sonderliche Gnade und Gabe Gottes ist, wer solches kann; denn viel Laduenkel und Klueglinge verfinstern oft ein Ding vorsatziglich, mit wunderlichen, seltsamen, ungebraeuchlichen Worten, erdenken neue Art und Weise zu reden, so zweifelhaftig, zweiuengig und geschraubet sind, die man kann deuten, wie man will, nach Gelegenheit der Umstaende, wie die Ketzer thun." "Man musz sich vor allen in acht nehmen, welche sich neuer, ungewoehnlicher und ungebraeuchlicher Worte befleissigen. Denn diese Art zu reden, widerstreitet gaenzlich der Beredsamkeit." (The study of dialectics [the art of reasoning, of presenting a matter so that truth can be distinguished from error] has served its most useful purpose when it has taught us to define and describe a thing fully and briefly as to its essentials, so that it can be known to be what it really is. Therefore, one should train himself to use right, true, and understandable words, such as are commonly used, and as tell in language easily understood what one means to say, which to do is a special gift of the grace of God, for many conceited fellows and wiseacres often intentionally obscure their thoughts by employing curious and strange words not commonly used, and by endeavoring to speak in an unusual way so that what they say is dubious, double-tongued, and so worded that it can be understood one way or another, as the circumstances suggest, and as heretics are accustomed to do." "One should be on his guard over against those who endeavor to use new, unusual, and uncommon words. That is not true eloquence.") (Luther, St. Louis Edition, XXII: 1534, 1536.)

There are three classes of people who resort to "fine writing" and "flowery speech": 1. Those who themselves do not understand the subject matter which they are treating. These love to use unusual words, big words, to hide their ignorance. Likely they have borrowed these from some of their reading and themselves often do not understand what they mean. These men ought not to speak or write at all. 2. Those who intentionally try to hide the real meaning of what they say or write. These use obscure or ambiguous language. They either have not the courage to speak their conviction, or they seek to deceive those who do not agree with them. This is characteristic of false teachers; it is the sheep's clothing worn by ravenous wolves. The books of some modern religious writers make hard reading. One often has to read a sentence two or three times before the meaning of the writer is discovered, if at all. 3. Those who would "show off" their learning. These consider it beneath their dignity to speak the language of the common man. They desire that the *hoi polloi* should know that they are listening to a learned man; and they always find some simple folk to whom they are awe-inspiring.

Speaking or writing in simple and clear language does not mean that one's vocabulary must be extremely limited nor that as a result there must be a lack of variety in presentation. The King James Version has six thousand different words; Milton uses thirteen thousand. To these we add the many words which were not used in those days, but which are commonly used and understood by the people in our day. That ought to be a sufficiently large vocabulary for any man to express his thoughts, unless he is speaking or writing for the learned professions, when unusual words and technical terms are used and understood. Even when speaking simply and clearly, we need not always use the same word, the same phrase, the same terminology, but can well use a variety of words and phrases, even as the Bible itself does, as for instance, when it speaks of sin as iniquity, transgression, trespass, fault, wickedness, evil, evildoing, corruption, backsiding, filthiness, crime, perverseness.

Paul was an educated man. Yet he said, "And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God. And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power; that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God," 1 Cor. 3:1, 4, 5. We shall do well to do as he did. Of the Savior it is said, "The common people heard Him gladly," Mark 12:37. They could understand what He said.

J. H. C. FRITZ



## Theological Observer

---

**A Voice from the Suomi Synod on Verbal Inspiration.**—In the *Gospel Messenger*, published in Hancock, Mich., the paper of the Finnish Lutheran body connected with the U. L. C. A. (the Suomi Synod), there appeared an article by Prof. Saarnivaara which has the title "Verbal Inspiration." The author endeavors to be fair and to be loyal to the Lutheran Confessions. The article is important, and we have to ask ourselves whether the position it sponsors is right or not. Since it is not long, we here reprint it.

"The question of the verbal inspiration of the Bible is one of the issues which continuously trouble the Lutheran churches of America and also, in some instances, keep them apart.

"I believe that all Lutherans agree in the conviction that the Bible has been written by the inspiration of God and that it is the highest and only decisive standard and rule for our faith and life, as our Confessions state. All Lutherans desire to be Scriptural in their teaching and faith.

"The dissension pertains to the kind and extent of the inspiration of Scripture. I believe there is some agreement also in this point: all Lutherans believe (or do they?) that there is some difference between the 'homologumena' and 'antilegomena' books of the Bible. Only those books regarding the authenticity and canonicity of which the early Church was unanimous are in a full measure the rule and standard of our faith. We base doctrine on them and explain the rest in accordance with them. So, e.g., we explain the Epistle of James, which belongs to the 'second-rate' books of the New Testament, in accordance with the teachings of the Epistles of Paul, and not Paul according to James.

"We believe also that all Lutherans, even the Lutherans of the Synodical Conference, admit that there are at least some smaller 'external' discrepancies even in the fully canonical books of the Bible (see J. Th. Mueller, *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 111). But, we think, all Lutherans agree that these discrepancies do not affect any vital doctrine of Christianity and are of no real significance.

"Thus we have a rather large agreement as to the inspiration and value of the Bible, and it seems to us that the whole controversy which we have had among us is somewhat 'foolish.' What good does it do to our souls and to the work of our Church to take a microscope and to examine and re-examine these non-significant 'defects' of the Bible? Is it not about the same as if one were to see a very fine piece of furniture, a masterpiece of carpentry, and then were to take a microscope to determine whether some small flaws may be found in it? Of course he will find some, but is he not foolish if he speaks of them again and again and at the same time forgets the beauty and excellency of that masterpiece?

"Those who prefer to pay all attention to the excellencies of the Bible can find a great number of statements in the writings and sermons

of Luther in which this Reformer presents his conviction that the Bible is the inspired Word of God and that we should put our whole trust in it as the Word of God. But at the same time those who prefer to pay attention to the 'discrepancies' and 'defects' can easily find many statements in Luther's writings in which he presents some criticisms, especially regarding the 'antilegomena' books.

"But is there any sense in doing this? If we continue in this manner, is there any hope of agreement and unity of spirit?

"It seems to us that the whole controversy is due to the fact that vital religion is at a low ebb in our churches: *since we are not very busy in saving souls, we have much time for such controversies.*

"The history of the Christian Church shows that when there have been spiritual awakenings people have not paid attention to the problem of the inspiration of the Bible and much less have they had time to make investigations into its possible 'defects.' They have simply believed in the Word of God and *proclaimed* it for the awakening and salvation of souls. All attention has been paid to the contents of the Bible, to what God says in His Word to sinful men, not how the Bible was written or, what was the relationship between the divine and human factors in it, or is it the inspired Word of God in every word and sentence, etc. In such times people have been busy in studying what the Bible says in its plain and clear statements, and in believing, obeying, and proclaiming them. They have followed the advice of Luther to 'lift one's hat and pass by' the obscure and troublesome passages.

"It is our conviction that if a God-sent revival removes the dead and formal churchliness from us Lutherans and makes us very busy in the question of the salvation of our own souls and the souls of others, the inspiration controversy will cease by itself and we will listen to and proclaim only what God says in His holy inspired Word. The important thing is to believe and obey it, as Luther did." —

Now for a few comments. The author does not quite understand the position of our esteemed colleague Dr. Mueller as it is stated on p. 111 of his *Christian Dogmatics*. The words read, "External contradictions, or seeming historical discrepancies, occur in Scripture, especially in quotations from the Old Testament, 1 Cor. 10:8 and Num. 25:9. The variants in the manuscripts, owing to faulty transcription, add to the number of these seeming contradictions. The wonder, however, is not that such seeming contradictions do occur in the Bible—for we must not forget that the copyists were fallible men, who were subject to error in transcribing the sacred text—but rather that, relatively speaking, there are so few of them and that in most cases they can be satisfactorily adjusted." There is, at first sight, an ambiguity here, because the existence of external contradictions is apparently admitted, although in what follows the modifier "seeming" is always used where the term "contradictions" (or its synonym "discrepancies") occurs. In writing the paragraph Dr. Mueller in his own mind affixed the modifier "seeming" to the opening expression and did not think of it that some reader might fail to do the same thing. In future editions of the book, so he informs the writer, the modifier will be supplied, or the ambiguity will be removed in some other way. As to Prof. Saarnivaara's general position,

that we are to preach the Word rather than trouble ourselves with seeming difficulties contained in it, we are in full agreement with him. That the Word be proclaimed, the Law in its severity, the Gospel in its full sweetness, let that be the function of the pastor, and let him not spend his time in the pulpit or in his private ministrations in discussing critical questions. But while this is true and needs to be emphasized again and again, we must at the same time not permit anybody to throw doubt on the full authority and plenary inspiration of our sacred volume. The attacks made on the credibility of the Scriptures have to be answered. The majesty of the Word must remain unimpaired. We think the history of Protestant theology has shown that the position which permits attacks on the inerrancy of the Scriptures to go unchallenged leads to the gravest results. The Andover theologians once upon a time battled for the inerrancy of the Scriptures. Gradually they gave up the struggle. Where is Congregationalism now? In the arms of Modernism and the social gospel; of Bible theology very little is left. *Vestigia terrent.*

A.

**Religion in State Schools.**—The question of religious education in state schools is one that is being studied in many countries. It is facing the people in England, in Canada (Ontario), in Australia, and in the United States. In Canada the 1945 regulations for the public schools in Ontario have been adopted, which, as the *Lutheran* (April 11, 1945), quoting from the *Ontario Teacher's Manual*, reports, provide "a teaching of the Bible as thorough and serious as that which the teacher gives to social studies or to science." There are to be daily devotional exercises to "consist largely of Scripture readings, prayer, and music. . . . Special consideration should be given to the recitation of the Lord's Prayer. . . . The children should be carefully taught its structure, content, and range. . . . Two thirty-minute periods per week are set aside for systematic study of the Scriptures. . . . Perhaps the finest service the teacher can render to the child in school is to help him to love the Bible." Other excerpts read: "If the child is to be taught well, body, mind, and spirit must be taught together. . . . The whole ordering of the school can and should contribute to religious growth. . . . The religious and spiritual side of education is thus a function of immeasurable importance in the formation of individual character as well as in the building of a healthy body, thus contributing to a finer citizenship and a better world." Of course, there are limitations. The *Lutheran* adds: "The Roman Catholics, of course, are not involved to any great extent, because they have their own separate schools. . . . If pastors object, they may teach the children of their own congregations at the school. If teachers have conscientious objections, the school boards shall make other arrangements. . . . All honest scruples are to be respected." In England, as the *Australasian Theological Review* (Dec. 31, 1944) reports, there was passed a "new Education Act with its provision that the schoolday in every state primary and secondary school shall commence with a corporate act of worship, and that there shall be religious instruction given by teachers who are part of the staff of the school." Referring to this Education Act, Mr. L. C. Robson, Headmaster,

S. C. E. G. S. (i. e., probably, Sydney Church of England Grammar School), North Sydney, has expressed himself in favor of the act in the *Australian Christian World* (Dec. 22, 1944), suggesting especially three "great principles" of religious education: 1. That children in all schools should be brought up to faith in God and allegiance to Him; 2. that they should be taught that Jesus Christ presented to us the perfect example of the good life, and should be instructed concerning His life and teaching; 3. that the life and work of the school should be directed primarily to inculcating the simple Christian virtues and to training character in approximation to the Christian ideal. In a discussion of Mr. Robson's plan Dr. H. H. Hamann points out that the religious education in state schools, following the "great principles" just quoted, involves considerable danger. He writes: "If Australia follows the lead of Great Britain in the matter of introducing corporate worship and religious instruction into state schools, Mr. Robson's plan is perhaps a foretaste of what we may expect. The 'religious' instruction dished up to school children will be something from which everything specifically Christian will have been carefully and rigorously excluded. This is plain from Mr. Robson's 'great principles.' Children are to be brought up to faith in God—i.e., to the belief that there is a God—and to allegiance to Him—just as every Sivaite Hindu child begins the day's work at school with an invocation to Ganesa. They should be taught that Jesus Christ presented to us the perfect example of the good life—Mr. Gandhi and innumerable other non-Christians have said the same thing. Schools are to inculcate the simple Christian virtues and to train character in approximation of the Christian ideal—here Mr. Robson forgets and disavows his previously maintained thesis that 'an ethic demands a faith.' He would have Christian ethics without anything remotely resembling the Christian faith. Well-meaning men like Mr. Robson do not see that, while attempting to advance the cause of religion and to make people religious, they are in reality degrading religion. For, quite apart from the things that are of paramount importance to the true Christian—the doctrines of sin and grace and salvation through Christ—these people regard religion not as something between man and his Maker, but as a tool for achieving what they conceive to be national unity. Religion has become an instrument of statecraft. The next step—short and fateful and perhaps inevitable—will probably be the hardening of this religious instruction into a form of state religion." Dr. Hamann, however, sees "another very serious aspect of the question." He continues: "By thus assuming or usurping functions that do not essentially and properly belong to it, the State treats all those subjects and citizens who hold their religion to be divinely revealed and divinely fixed, and hence not to be interfered with by men in any manner, with a discrimination which can easily become tyranny. To be sure, there is a conscience clause. But the very appeal to a conscience clause by what may prove a small minority tends to place upon that minority a stigma, an odium, which is both undeserved and unjust. Religious teaching that is embodied in a prescribed syllabus comes very close to representing the official teaching of the State; and since the avowed

purpose of such teaching is largely the fostering of common ideals and a common purpose, conscientious dissenters will increasingly be regarded not merely as religious isolationists, but as disturbers of national unity. Clergymen who claim the name of Christian are in the forefront of those who would rob Christ of His glory as the divine Redeemer by advocating religious teaching that is essentially pagan, though adorned with the name of Christ. Are they trying to atone for their notorious neglect in giving sound and persistent spiritual instruction to their people by a corresponding zeal in striving to make the State do the work of the Church? Evidently they do not realize that they are endeavoring to re-introduce some of the evils of state-churchism; just as evidently, they have forgotten the words of the Master 'Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's.' The problem of religious instruction in state schools is obviously one of great complexity. But it has its advantage, too; for it reminds us very impressively of the sacred duty which both the Christian church and the Christian home have in this matter and, above all, of the almost absolute necessity of the Christian parish school.

J. T. M.

**The Christian Faith in the Land of the Reformation.**—Dr. Lawrence Meyer, after having returned from his visit to Europe, placed into the hands of the undersigned a number of documents for proof that the Christian faith is still alive in the Land of the Reformation and that the almost unspeakable tribulations experienced by believers there have not been able to destroy the evangelical faith. One document, entitled "Circular Letters to Christian Friends and Students," is written by a "34-year-old theologian" who was asked by the Bishop of Wuerttemberg to take up theological work at Stuttgart on October 1, 1942. The letters were composed in the fall and winter of 1943. He writes: "The latest, and perhaps the most important, part of my work is a course on 'Dogmatics for Laymen,' at Stuttgart, entitled 'Fundamental Principles of the Christian Faith. A Course of Lectures for Friends and Opponents of the Church.' We meet every Thursday, and I hope to be able to complete the study of Luther's Short Catechism in one year. St. Mark's Church soon proved to be too small, and we were obliged to move to the 'Stiftskirche,' the cathedral of Stuttgart. This church, too, is always filled to overflowing, the congregation often numbering over 4,000. What gives me even greater happiness than the size of the congregation is the fact that it is made up of members of every class and calling. By far the larger number are young people, and men and women who lead very busy lives. Many of them are soldiers of every rank. The attendance is entirely voluntary, and it is not easy for the people to come. Many of them arrive long before the time; many come by train, most of them straight from work, very often without having had supper, and many cannot even find a seat. The way in which the young people respond is marvelous." Again: "My parents in Barmen have gone through a terrible time. In the last awful air raid they lost all their possessions and just barely managed to escape alive. The whole of my father's large and precious library is lost. The town that was my home

no longer exists. Can you imagine what it is like when all of one's friends and relatives are either dead or scattered, when the churches in which one was confirmed and in which one has held services oneself, are razed to the ground, and when the school one has attended is completely wiped out? But the Word of God and the hymns of our fathers help us to lift up our hearts, and they become more and more precious as time goes on. Whenever I enter the pulpit at the 'Stiftskirche' and see the crowds thronging the church, I cannot help thinking that perhaps by the very next day there will be nothing left but smoking ruins and that the huge congregation may be homeless—gone with the wind. In Barmen, Pastor Lilje spoke in the Gemarker Church just before the catastrophe. A few days later the beautiful old church was gone, and most of the worshipers at that last service were either dead or homeless wanderers. Experiences such as these teach us what St. Paul meant when he said, 'As having nothing and yet possessing all things.' Again: "Every morning when I go into my study and see the rows of books on the shelves, I feel so thankful that they are still there—that they have been given to me anew. Every time I see a church full of people, my heart swells with gratitude that God has called them once more and that it is still 'the acceptable time.'" The last of the circular letters closes with the words: "We do not know *what* is coming, but we know *who* is coming," i. e., the "coming Lord." In a lecture before the students of Concordia Seminary Dr. Meyer remarked: "When it will become known that it was largely the Lutheran Confessing Church that resisted tyranny and oppression, our opportunities for church work in the Land of the Reformation will be greatly increased." —A very detailed typescript, entitled "Reports and Documents Regarding the Effect of the Air War on the Churches in Germany" (*Berichte und Dokumente ueber die Auswirkungen des Luftkrieges auf die Kirchen in Deutschland*) contains overwhelming proof that the faith of many has been remarkably purified and strengthened by the very suffering which they endured. One paragraph reads: "A report sent to me closes with the words: 'It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, because His compassions fail not. They are new every morning: great is Thy faithfulness' (Lam. 3:22, 23). Indeed, the Lord's mercies do not fail! The Church which is faithful to its commission to preach the Gospel of the crucified and risen Jesus Christ in our time, with its special needs and its pitiless severity, may courageously and joyously say in faith: 'I shall not die, but live and declare the works of the Lord' (Ps. 118:17)." The document is dated November, 1944.

J. T. M.

**Our Share in the War Guilt.** — Writing in the *Christian Century* on the topic "War, Peace, and the Churches," Norman Thomas expresses these noteworthy sentiments: "I have no desire to deny the crimes of the Nazis and the Japanese war lords or the atrocities of which they have been guilty. Neither would I deny that the principal responsibility for starting this war lies on the Nazis and the Japanese imperialists. That, however, is not inconsistent with the conviction that war springs from the crimes of a social order for which all nations are more or less responsible. It is not true that the United

States was attacked as an innocent bystander by a thug. It is now pretty generally admitted that we virtually declared war when we passed Lend-Lease. And Winston Churchill told the British House of Commons that the President had assured him that America would go to war against Japan even if not attacked. John T. Flynn's *The Truth about Pearl Harbor* contains much food for thought. But for my present purpose the question, what government or governments started the war is relatively immaterial. I am interested in human beings. In varying degrees it is true that the people share responsibility for the governments they accept, but I confess to a feeling of disgust when, in conversation, a man tells me that there is no important difference in guilt between Hitler and the German people or between the Japanese war lords and the mass of the workers and peasants. They, he insists, are responsible for their governments. Almost invariably, in a few minutes, if I continue the conversation, he will proclaim his powerlessness to do anything about civic corruption in his own town or about those deeds of the Roosevelt administration which he dislikes. As a matter of cold fact, the number of heroes who prefer liberty or righteousness to death [life?] is small. What we demand of the German and Japanese people would likewise condemn the occupied countries of Europe and China, all of which have furnished workers for the conqueror and some of which have furnished soldiers for him. There is no biological or logical reason for justifying the wholesale slaughter of the women and children of the enemy peoples as if they were guilty of a peculiar sort of original sin. There is an ancient book on which today's preachers ought to comment more often. Let them consider a modern application of Jonah 4:11. God asks the sullen prophet, 'Should not I have regard for Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand, and also much cattle?"'

Norman Thomas, it will be recalled, once upon a time (1911-1918) was a Presbyterian minister, and five times he has served the Socialist party as candidate for the presidency of the United States. On the historical and political details contained in the words quoted, we do not wish to pronounce. But it seems to us he is right when he asserts that we cannot escape a certain responsibility for the horrible butchery and indescribable suffering affecting a great part of mankind today. No one of us can view the great tragedies of Europe and the Pacific with feelings of self-righteousness. With penitent and humble hearts and with feelings of deepest sympathy for the sufferers in the war area we ought to approach the day when the news of final victory for our arms will be proclaimed.

A.

**What This War Is Doing to Chaplains.**—With this matter the *Lutheran Companion* (April 11, 1945) concerns itself in an editorial on the basis of an article that appeared in the *Woman's Home Companion*, written by Lieutenant Jim Lucas, a combat correspondent with the United States Marine Corps (cf. April issue, *When the Chaplain Comes Home*). The writer suggests that "many of the chaplains will be difficult to recognize when they return to their parishes, though most of the changes will be for the better." In the editorial the second last para-

graph, which is not in quotation marks, has this to say: "A greater spirit of tolerance toward people of other faiths will undoubtedly be another of the by-products of the chaplain's war experience. Being compelled to minister to men of all religious beliefs, the chaplain finds that he must get down to simple, elemental truths. Even if he had the inclination to do so, there is neither time nor opportunity in the military service for a chaplain to draw sharp doctrinal distinctions. The chaplain knows that he is working on 'borrowed time' and there are many souls to save." Similar thoughts are expressed in an editorial in the *Australasian Theological Review* (Dec. 31, 1944), a paragraph of which reads: "Our source also quotes from the *Lutheran Standard* the following sentences, which originally appeared in the *Christian Century*: 'The rest (all denominations other than Roman Catholic) must work together as a unit. Such a thing as closed [close] communion, for example, is impossible. Chaplains who feel that they can not administer communion to all Christians alike are properly dropped from the chaplaincy during the training period.' The *Standard* is also reported as quoting the words of a chaplain: 'I served communion to men of 22 different denominations, and there was no question of creed or sect. It beats any church council you ever heard of. Let us take down the fences between ourselves and others.' No wonder the *Standard* asks the question: 'Will our chaplains come home Lutherans or inter-denominationalists?'" The entire editorial in the *Australasian Theological Review* was elaborated with special reference to an article which appeared in the *Presbyterian Guardian* and bore the title "Re-thinking the Chaplaincy." Very soberly Prof. H. Hamann comments on the quotations which he has offered his readers regarding chaplaincies (we print his remarks in part): "Without question, the situation is more difficult and complex than some good people would have it. It is just a little disquieting to find a Presbyterian journal raising the issues of Church and State, and even of religious indifferentism, where the voice of confessional and conservative Lutheranism is silent. However, one should not pass judgment on the strength of data that are insufficient and inconclusive; and it must not be forgotten that one reads also the most emphatic assurances that 'the Lutheran chaplain is not obliged to do one thing in violation of his conscience' (cf. CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, August, 1944; p. 573f.). Similar assurances have been given to and by the officials of our Church with respect to chaplains in the Australian army. Nevertheless, it would not be amiss to study the principles involved as well as the actual experiences of our chaplains once the end of the war has put us into a mood for calm reflection. When the war began, the only argument heard—if argument it can be called—was: 'Others have chaplains, why can't we have them?' Of course, we must look after the spiritual welfare of our members in the armed forces to the best of our ability; and the fact that the Government gives officer's rank and pay to chaplains is certainly very convenient. As long as it is clear that there is no sacrificing of principle to expedience, the need of 're-thinking the chaplaincy' will not arise." To us Dr. Hamann's comment seems very helpful. On the one hand, the principles involved in the matter of chaplaincies merit constant study; on the other, this is hardly the time to strike alarm as

long as we are assured by our chaplains that there is "no sacrificing of principles to expedience." There are, no doubt, indifferent chaplains whose Communion practice is as reprehensible as that reported by the *Lutheran Standard*, but very likely their Communion practice was no better in peace time. Again, it is to be expected that many of our soldiers returning from the war will come with vexing questions that are suggested by the very unscriptural practice of careless chaplains, and such men must be rightly instructed from the Word of God. In general, however, we believe that faithful chaplains and soldiers will return pretty much the same as when they entered the war service. Obviously the dangerous times in which we live demand conscientious watchfulness, but the situation does not find its remedy in undue alarmism.

J. T. M.

**A Frank Admission as to the Plight of Present-Day Protestantism.**

A long editorial in the *Christian Century* in which the much publicized anti-creedal remarks of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., are criticized contains in its closing section this striking paragraph: "Nothing is so pathetic in modern Protestantism as its confusion over its own faith. It stands hesitant and uncertain in the presence of a society which has become indifferent to its appeal. The Church has passed out of the consideration and even the respect of vast numbers representing the sophisticated portion of the community. It confronts this condition with two competing strategies: that of an opaque and wooden conservatism against whose preachments the ears of the 'emancipated' are scornfully deaf; and that of a sycophantic liberalism which is engaged in adjusting and adapting Christianity to the 'religious values' which it pretends to find in the prevailing secularism. It is hoped thus to make 'religion' respectable and palatable. One cannot say which of these strategies is the more inept. Both are illusory and sterile. The hope of Protestantism lies in the possibility that a new intellectual leadership is emerging whose faith is anchored in historical Christianity and whose thought has been rendered flexible and lucid by the discipline of liberalism without succumbing to its illusions. Such leadership will be able to use the weapons of liberalism to expose its pretensions, to explain Christianity without explaining it away. Thus, we may believe, the way may be cleared for Christian unity and the hearts of men opened to the precious proclamation of the Christian Gospel. The modern man is not yearning for the kind of church which imperialistic liberalism offers. What he is yearning for is a faith—the faith which he once had and has lost." What sad and saddening words! The confessional preaching which is found in Lutheran pulpits undoubtedly would be classified by the editor as belonging to the "opaque and wooden conservatism" which he says the modern, sophisticated mind will not listen to. And still he realizes that a real faith will have to be offered to people if they are to continue to pay attention to work done by the representatives of religion and to co-operate with them. Our comment is simply the word of St. Paul, 1 Cor. 1:23f, "We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block and unto the Greeks foolishness, but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God."

A.

**Moscow on Top.**—Perhaps our readers will appreciate the opportunity of perusing a paragraph from an article in the *Christian Century* having the title "Stalin and the Orthodox Church." The article is written by an authority on matters pertaining to Russia and the Balkans, R. H. Markham, who once upon a time edited a daily newspaper in Sofia. After having stated in the opening paragraph that "the Kremlin is again the political head of about 150 million Christians; the powerful, self-appointed defender of 13 million Orthodox worshipers in Rumania, 5,250,000 in Bulgaria, 6,500,000 in Greece, 7,500,000 in Yugoslavia, four million in Poland, and other millions in other places," he in one of the final paragraphs presents this general picture, "Sweeping events, grand military triumphs, and remarkable diplomacy have placed Stalin in a position never even approached by a Russian tsar. Four mighty currents merging in a stupendous stream, carry him forward. One is the steadily mounting Russian nationalism, nourished by the most resplendent victories in Russian annals, supported by the largest land army of all time, and stimulated by the acclaim of the world. Another is a flaming secular religion of apocalyptic social reform, inspiring furious fanaticism, unrolling visions of millennial prosperity, eliciting boundless sacrifice and drawing toward Red Moscow the devotion of millions in almost every land upon the globe, from China through Europe to America. A third current is pan-Slavism, which tends to draw every Slav group toward Mother Russia, who, the Slavs say, is leading them all into the Slav epoch of human history. And the fourth current is the revived Holy Eastern Orthodox Church, encouraging and sanctifying a Russian messianism as natural and dynamic as America's own 'manifest destiny.'" Let all who are optimistic about the future carefully read and ponder this paragraph.

A.

**Famine Conditions.**—As in many other parts of the world, food conditions in India are appalling. A report of Eric W. Johnson of the American Friends Service Committee states: "Acute, war-caused distress exists today in India. Epidemics are raging. Tens of millions are destitute. India needs America's help. If you were to go today into a typical village of Bengal—and ninety per cent of the people of India live in villages—you would probably find two people in every family of five suffering from malaria. A year ago the families were larger than they are now, since from one to three million Indians, depending upon whether you accept government or official estimates, died directly from starvation during 1943 and 1944. . . . Almost every child still bears the marks of famine and disease. Again, if the village were typical, you would find no facilities for medical care—not even the simplest dispensary. In normal times life in India is not easy, and we should certainly never accept such standards here. But the war has greatly lowered this level of life. The famine was largely war-caused. Because of the war India's people are today desperate."

We take these sentences from the *Christian Century* of March 14. The correspondent reporting on the work Mr. Johnson's committee is doing states: "The work of the American Friends Service Committee includes setting up milk canteens, distributing over thirty million multi-

vitamin tablets, over two million tablets of sulfaguanidine, sulfathiazole, sulfapuridine, fourteen million tablets of alabrine for malaria, and certain amounts of cash for the purchase of supplies locally for quick emergency food relief in India."

**Brief Items.**—The publishing house of Fleming H. Revell Company has observed its 75th birthday. The well-known evangelist D. L. Moody was married to the sister of Mr. Revell, so that beside the spiritual kinship there existed a bond of physical relationship connecting the two men. The firm of Fleming H. Revell became known as "publishers of evangelical literature."

Thomas Campbell was recently ordained as New Jersey's first Negro Catholic priest. Church records, according to the *Los Angeles Tribune*, show that there are now nineteen Negro Catholic priests in this country.—*Christian Century*.

The new Army Chief of Chaplains is the Rev. Luther D. Miller, an Episcopalian. He succeeds the Rev. William R. Arnold, a Roman Catholic, who has been given an overseas inspection assignment. Chaplain Miller has served as army chaplain for twenty-six years.

In England the Rev. Alfred E. Garvie, a well-known leader of the Congregationalists, died recently. One of his chief interests was "the ecumenical movement."

Members of Free Churches in Great Britain may now be buried in all Church of England cemeteries with rites by their own ministers, a recent issue of the *British Weekly* announces. . . . Since 1880, Non-conformists have been granted the right of burial in such cemeteries. However, the intent of the law has often been defeated because donors of land for burial purposes have specified in the deeds that only the Anglican service could be used on the premises, and rectors have in some cases insisted on conducting rites not desired by families of the deceased.—*Christian Century*.

26,000 Negro men and 6,000 Negro women are now employed in Cleveland industry, as compared with 5,000 men and 400 women in 1940, reports at the 27th Annual Meeting of the Urban League of Cleveland revealed.—*Christian Century*.

In the past nine years more than 200 of the 1900 churches serving rural communities in South Dakota have closed their doors. In Iowa the rural population has declined by one-sixth since 1941.

*Christian Century*

A correspondent, sending a letter to the *Christian Century*, says, "Catholics consider the Gospel a proclamation of truth about God, man, and man's redemption. Protestants consider the Gospel an irenicon. (Passages like Matt. 10:34 can always be disposed of somehow!) Or the issue can be stated even more briefly: Catholic zeal for truth versus Protestant zeal for tolerance. Protestants were not ever thus. There was a time when Protestants took seriously the *truth* which is in Christ. All they seem to care about now is 'ecumenicity.'" This criticism is justified with respect to a large part of Protestantism. But as for the

Catholic zeal, it strikes us that it is like the zeal which St. Paul speaks of Rom. 10:2.

In his syndicated article of April 7 George E. Solkolsky, the well-known newspaper commentator, makes some observations which are just as depressing as apparently they are true. Speaking of the surprise which swept the country when the true facts about the secret agreement in Yalta became known, facts which in highest quarters, so it is asserted, had been reported with disregard of "literal truth," he maintains that nobody need have been surprised, because in most countries people no longer speak with an eye to the truth, but to expediency; and it is no longer the desire to fulfill their duties which actuates them, but the craving for power and position. He adds that lies, regardless of whether you place them in the category of the black or the white lies, no longer are regarded as a violation of honor and morality.—Our comment is: The world is becoming ripe for the Judgment.

Dr. Eric M. North, secretary of the [American Bible] Society, reported that 10,000 copies of Nestle's Ancient Greek Testament had been authorized to be supplied German theological schools immediately after the war. He said the American Society and the British Foreign Bible Society plan jointly to supply 700,000 Bibles, 1,776,000 Testaments, and 3,300,000 Gospels to liberated areas in Europe and the Far East in the near future.—R. N. S.

"An encouraging note for all who are concerned for the continuance—or perhaps I should say restoration—of what we used to call a 'classical education' is struck by President Seymour of Yale, in his annual report. With fine irony he quotes from the recent book on postwar education which expresses rejoicing over our having 'eliminated much that was dead and useless,' and concentrated 'on what can immediately be used, . . . having set aside classics, theology, and philosophy.' President Seymour's terse comment is: 'Yale disagrees. We plan not to eliminate, but to strengthen these studies.' Further, he says that experience has already proved that 'accelerated' courses of study give the student what amounts to mental indigestion and that a twelve months' college year wears out the faculty. It is to be hoped that other colleges will follow the same line." —Dr. D. D. Burrell in the *Presbyterian*.

Legislation providing for voluntary Bible instruction in the public schools was passed at the recently adjourned session of the State Legislature. The law followed the pattern of laws already in effect which call for the teaching to be done by clergymen of the various faiths on a special day during the week within the regular school hours. Though the new measure was proposed only after much study had been put on it and though it was passed by a large majority, Governor McWallgren vetoed it, saying that "the matter needed more careful study."

#### Correspondence from Seattle in the *Christian Century*

Speaking of the saddening conditions obtaining in the religious field in America, Dr. Clarence Edward Macartney of Pittsburgh in an address on the subject "Is America on the Road to Ruin?" said, "Among the contributory causes for this alarming and lamentable decline are: the increasing secularization of the sabbath day, the disloyalty of so large

a proportion of Protestants to the ordinance of public worship; the sweep of the moving picture business, with seventy-five million in attendance every week; and in the church itself the substitution of a general, social, and international preaching for the personal and individual message of redemption and salvation. As Norman Thomas, the several times Socialist candidate for President, formerly Presbyterian minister, put it: 'No church justifies itself by becoming a forum. For the minister a social conscience and some humanitarian enthusiasm are no substitute for a living message about a God whose love and power he has found not only his peace, but also his crown of hope for the victory of the kingdom of God and peace for all mankind.'

The new Archbishop of Finland, successor of Archbishop Erkki Kaila († last December), is Bishop Aleksi Lehtonen of Tammerfors. The Norwegian government-in-exile in London appointed the Rev. Arne Fjellbu Archbishop of Liberated Norway. The latter was born in Decorah, Iowa.

Although the most violent phase of the outburst seems to have receded, acts of physical violence against Protestants have not altogether ceased. On January 21, in Concepcion Enyege, a village in the State of Mexico, a group of fanatics headed by one Estebon Hernandez stoned Lazos Hernandez, a Protestant minister, and three of his church members. Mr. Hernandez, whose head was badly bruised, was taken to a hospital in Mexico City. There is little hope of his recovery.

Correspondence in the *Christian Century* from Mexico, D.F.



---

## Book Review

---

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo.

**The Power of the Keys. The Original Faith of the Lutheran Church Presented in Quotations from Luther and the Lutheran Confessions.** By Uuras Saarnivaara, professor of systematic and exegetical theology, Suomi College and Theological Seminary, Hancock, Mich. Brochure, 64 pages. 25 cents. [If ordered by students of seminaries or colleges (10 or more copies) or for free distribution, 10 cents.] Order directly from author; address: Suomi College, Hancock, Mich.

Because of the importance of the subjects treated and also on account of various doctrinal aberrations defended in it, this brief pamphlet deserves perhaps a more lengthy discussion. With great seriousness, and evidently desiring to restore erring Lutherans to pure Lutheranism, as taught by Luther and the Lutheran Confessions (the author believes that "the Lutheran Church [today] has only the crumbs left of the Gospel that Luther proclaimed and that therefore a return to the original faith of our Church is sorely needed," p. 62), the writer directs himself (in the main) against externalistic and indifferent despisers of the means of grace as also against sectarian enthusiasts to impress upon them the importance of the fifth and the sixth chief part of Luther's Catechism: Confession, Absolution, and the Lord's Supper. He presents the subject matter by first quoting on a given point Luther and the Lutheran Confessions and then putting a number of either-or questions which should move the readers to consider whether or not they are sincere Christians and true Lutherans. The material is discussed under sixteen questions: "What is the Christian Church?" "Where shall we find Christ and His grace?" "What is true repentance?" "To whom should we confess our sins?" "What sins should we confess in private confession?" "What is the value and benefit of private confession?" "What is the Power of the Keys?" "What is the spiritual priesthood of Christians?" "How do we receive the forgiveness of sins?" "How can we appropriate the righteousness of Christ?" "What is the meaning of the laying on of hands?" "Does absolution depend on contrition and should it be pronounced conditionally?" "How are we to believe in the forgiveness of sins?" "Should we use private confession and absolution before going to the Lord's Supper?" "How should the celebration of the Lord's Supper be arranged, and who should be admitted to it?" "Who receives the Lord's Supper worthily?" To these questions there is added a "Conclusion," with the charge that today Lutheranism (not liberal, but orthodox) has apostatized from the doctrine of Luther and the Lutheran Confessions (confession and absolution) and must therefore return to its original pure form. The reviewer, having had correspondence with the author and understanding the background of his problem, hastens to assure his readers that his statements and strictures are well-intentioned, and he urges his fellow ministers to order the

pamphlet and study it thoroughly, especially as the doctrines which Professor Saarnivaara discusses are sorely neglected in some Lutheran circles. For the greater part, the author is right in what he says, and his soul-searching questions are indeed vital in view of the prevailing formalism and indifferentism. But he errs in putting too great stress on private confession (e.g., pp. 17, 20, 23, 52, etc.), just as if it were impossible for a Christian to obtain forgiveness without it. Again, there is too great an emphasis on the absolution pronounced by the pastor (e.g., 26, 34, etc.), as if those who did not receive absolution from the confessor could not have full assurance of the forgiveness of their sins. Moreover, the impression is created as if the Gospel preached by a hypocritical pastor were not valid (p. 32). Then, too, the writer seems to present the spoken Word as if that alone were the channel of God's absolution (p. 37; Baptism and Holy Communion are of course recognized as means of grace). Lastly, it is said that the laying on of hands is not a mere ceremony but a means by which forgiveness (*ex opere operato?*) is imparted (pp. 41, 52). In some cases the language is not sufficiently clear for the reader to determine just what is meant, but there is no doubt an overemphasis on private confession and the pastor's absolution. There are numerous grammatical errors which should be corrected (pp. 23, 46, 50, 60, 61, etc.). Professor Saarnivaara cites for his declarations Luther and the Lutheran Confessions, but often in such a way that the quotations are misleading (e.g., p. 41: "According to the ordinance of God, sins are forgiven through the laying on of hands"). Frequently the following quotations explain and amplify Luther's briefer statements. Upon the whole, the reader will find the pamphlet most interesting, thought-provoking, and instructive; and notwithstanding its faults it deserves a word of commendation for bringing the doctrine of confession and absolution so emphatically before Lutherans for examination and study.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

**Our Creed.** By J. M. Weidenschilling, M. A., S. T. D. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 35 cents.

The contents of this booklet (136 pages) were originally prepared as a course for the Bible classes in our Church. They appeared in the January, 1942, issue of *Concordia Bible Student*. Our Synodical Board for Parish Education encouraged the author to issue this course on *Our Creed* in book form, as a companion volume to his previous manuals *Our Bible* and *Our Church*, which found favorable reception.

Here we have a manual which pastors can urge their members to purchase for their private indoctrination and which they can use for Bible-study groups and societies in the congregation.

L. J. SIECK

**Let Not Your Heart be Troubled.** Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 15 cents.

In an attractive cover we find 16 pages, one of which is dedicatory, the others each captioned by and based on a comforting text, with a brief poem or Scripture lesson in the body of the page. We have not seen any folder to express sympathy and offer comfort to the bereaved which can equal this one.

L. J. SIECK

**The Church and the Liberal Society.** By Emmet John Hughes, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1944. xv + 310 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

Here is an interesting book. The reader will find it difficult to stop, once he starts reading it. But it is far from light reading. It is a profound philosophy and interpretation of the last 400 years of history. The author seems to be a Catholic, though this is not acknowledged in so many words. However, the interpretation of the great historical figures, events, and trends of the 400 years treated is very definitely Catholic in point of view. But despite the obvious Catholic bias, the book ought to be read and carefully studied by Protestants and Catholics alike. It is written for our age and will help the reader understand the times in which we are living, and it may do even more: it may help to blast that sense of smug complacency so characteristic of the Church and of society at large today.

The book is divided into four major sections: Part I, The Genesis of Liberal Society; Part II, The Making of Liberal Society; Part III, Liberal Society and the Church Militant; Part IV, The Crisis of the West.

In Part I the author discusses the genesis of Liberal Society. Fifty-one pages are devoted to this section. He points out that the instruments were many with which was fashioned the Liberal Society. The pen of Voltaire, the sword of Cromwell, the telescope of Galileo, the "mysticism" of Luther, the logic of Calvin, the optimism of Rousseau, and the realism of Machiavelli all have made their respective contribution. The revolution which was brought about by these divergent factors affected every sphere of society. It gave rise to the modern secular state and modern imperialism, both completely divorced from the religious and ethical influence of the Church. It placed the industrial middle class, the men of business, into positions of power. Movable capital supplanted tenure of land, thus creating what is now known as the capitalistic system. But the most fundamental effect was the change of man's attitude towards God, the universe, and his neighbor. In short, the secular materialistic way of life of the world today is the direct result of this revolution.

Here the Catholic bias of the author is everywhere much in evidence. The Middle Ages appear as the great golden age of the past. The Catholic Church is the great unifying element in that world shedding its benign blessing upon universal Christendom. The discerning student of history will not be disturbed. He will readily admit that there was a bright side to the medieval world and that this period of history had found a solution for many of the political, social, and economic problems which are troubling us today, but he is also familiar with the reverse side of this picture. Darkness, ignorance, religious superstition, a corrupt Church, tyranny and oppression, and countless other evils cast their gloomy shadows over that golden age of the Catholic Church. Mexico and South America and other Catholic countries have enjoyed the benign blessings of the Roman Church for the past 400 years, and surely no one would suggest that conditions in these countries are a solution of the problems which are confronting the western world today.

In Part II the author traces the making of the Liberal Society. Eighty-six pages are devoted to this section.

The Reformation period is the watershed from which descend all the rivers and rivulets which make up the broad sweeping streams of modern liberal society. The new emerging age is an age of science and not of faith. Everything of the past is questioned and placed on trial, and with it even the Christian God and Christian revelation. Science is the arsenal in which the weapons against God and the Church are forged. Beginning with Leonardo, the author follows the development of liberal thought to the great high priests of the new age—Descartes, Hume, Hobbes, Spinoza, the Deists, Voltaire, Adam Smith, and many others—who have made their contribution towards the secularization of the modern world. "As long as there are fools and knaves," wrote Voltaire to Frederick the Great in 1767, "there will be religion. Ours is the most ridiculous, the most absurd, and the most bloody that has ever infected the world. Your majesty will do the human race an eternal service in extirpating this infinite superstition." These men de-natured God and deified nature. They put the torch to the "City of God" to illuminate the "City of Man." And what a utopia this new world would be according to their bombastic promises! "Humanity, which for centuries had been enslaved and degraded by worshiping false gods, would now cut its way through the last crumbling ruins of a dying world into the clean, clear land of the future. A fuller, finer life would reward those who were guided by the light of reason. For political states a strong and productive land would be theirs. For the world of nations, peace and security would come to an age which could have no more wars; for all wars thus far have been either religious or dynastic, and peace would naturally follow when men dispensed with religion and overthrew dynasty."

This section is beautifully done, offers much food for thought, and shows that what we are reaping today was not sown only yesterday. Godless men for centuries have sown the storm, and we are now reaping the whirlwind which is shattering into atoms the utopia these men have built in their vanity. "Because that when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened; professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." Rom. 1:21, 22.

Parts III and IV. In the 132 pages devoted to these two sections the author analyzes with keen penetration the period of history which lies between the Congress of Vienna and the Congress of Versailles and the events that followed. He shows what shameless shams and hypocrisy dominated both congresses and with what ruthless disregard for human life and human personality the masters of the new industrial and imperialistic age which followed expanded the "City of Man." New and ever bigger temples were built to the god of mammon. The forms of the old religions survived, but its business was to confine itself strictly to the "religious," to dogmas and liturgies, but not to life. The old Christian ethics were abandoned, and a new simple formula took their place. All is moral which increases production and adds profit to

profits for the faithful of the new creed. The symbol of the Middle Ages had been the cathedral; the symbol of the new and modern age was the factory and the slum. Slums, semislums, superslums, and more slums were the fruits of this new superior faith. And blinded by the external glitter of material success, the poets glorified this age of callous inhumanity to man. Philosophers provided the rationale, and the Church its religious sanction and pious blessings.

But then came 1914 and 1939. Wm. James had cried, "Damn the absolute creeds," and the wise ones of the world had nodded their solemn assent. And then came Hitler and damned them, and the wise ones were surprised and startled and now are walking about dazed and confused among the ruins of the "City of Man" which they have built.

I repeat, here is a book which should not only be read, but carefully studied. Except for the Catholic bias, which is in evidence in places and the halo which is cast over the Middle Ages and over the humanitarian pronouncements of modern popes, this is a great book and a wonderful analysis of the trends of thought and of the events of the last 400 years of human history. There is so much naive and sophomoric prattle in the world of which we are a part that even Christians and Christian leaders are becoming confused. A study of this book, especially if followed by a further study of the extensive and yet carefully selected bibliography provided by the author, may help to bring men back to a more sober evaluation of the false prophets whose blind leadership has brought a blinded world to the brink of its own destruction.

A. M. REHWINKEL

**The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible.** Edited by G. E. Wright and F. V. Filson. An introductory article by W. F. Albright. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, Pa. 114 pages, 11×16. \$3.50.

This is the most complete and up-to-date Bible atlas the reviewer has ever seen. It is entirely new, not just a revision of some previous work, and contains values not found in any other Bible atlas. The *Atlas*, for example, contains 33 maps in full color in the latest style, and 2 in black and white. Each map plate is accompanied by detailed explanatory and correlated discussion, carefully worked out and practically oriented. An excellent index to the maps, including a topographical concordance to the Bible, and an equally helpful index to the text make it easy for the reader to find in a very short time any site or any fact stated in the *Atlas*. The book is divided as follows: I. A general survey of Palestine. II—VII. A historical part, covering the period from the beginning of the world to the Patriarchs and thereafter, ending with Judah in Nehemiah's time. VIII. An enlarged section of maps of Palestine with topographical and historical discussions and geographical illustration. XI. A discussion of the various world empires (Assyrian, Persian, Hellenistic, etc.) from ca. 700 B.C. to ca. 275 B.C. XII—XVI. Palestine and the Mediterranean world from the Maccabean Period, ca. 168 B.C. to Constantine, ca. 325 A.D. XVII. A history of Jerusalem from Israelite times to the present day. XVIII. Archaeological excavations in modern Palestine.

Even this comprehensive outline of the contents of the *Atlas* will perhaps not give the reader of this review an adequate conception of the vast amount of time, labor, and scientific research that went into the making of this outstanding modern Bible atlas, which on account of its excellent maps, illustrations, and its valuable historical, scientific, archaeological, and topographical information merits a place in the library of every pastor and teacher. As a reference work in school libraries it is invaluable. Unfortunately, so far as the believing Bible student is concerned, the *Atlas* contains many views and statements to which he cannot agree. In a general way, it is oriented to modern scientific (evolutionistic) bias. The "Chronological Outline of Ancient History," for example, reckons with the Stone Age, which began some 200,000 to 500,000 years ago (p. 15). The user of the *Atlas* who knows how to reckon with the objectionable view of destructive Bible critics and is able to separate the wheat from the chaff will nevertheless not regret having purchased the book. The excellent maps, illustrations, and the many pages of reliable geographical and historical material will richly repay him for the disappointment he experiences in finding reason pitted against revelation in this otherwise fine book; and besides, he will learn from it what really unbelieving scientists believe regarding the Bible, and that upon no substantial proof whatever. Despite its serious faults, the reviewer recommends this new and in many ways helpful atlas to his brethren in the preaching and the teaching ministry for judicious study. The mechanical make-up of the *Atlas* is in every way excellent.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

#### BOOKS RECEIVED

*From Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo.:*

**We Walk by Faith.** Daily Devotions from Easter Monday to Pentecost. No. 60. By Chaplain Alfred P. Klausler. 62 pages. Price: 5 cents per copy, postpaid; 48 cents per dozen, postage extra; \$3.00 per hundred, postage extra.

**Der Auferstandene und die Seinen.** Kurze Andachten fuer die Zeit vom Ostermontag bis zum 20. Mai 1945. Rev. George A. Naumann. Price, same as above.

**Concordia Bible Teacher,** Volume VI, Number 2, April, 1945. Topic: "The Christian and His Country." 128 pages. 75 cents per annum.

**Concordia Bible Student,** Volume XXXIV, Number 2, April, 1945. Topic: "The Christian and His Country." 128 pages. 50 cents per annum.

*From the Moody Press, Chicago, Illinois:*

**The Missionary and Anthropology.** An introduction to the study of primitive man for missionaries. By Gordon Hedderly Smith, B.D. \$1.50.

